

THE
SOCIAL GOSPEL

SHAILER MATHEWS

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA



UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

~~UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY~~
~~UPLAND, CALIFORNIA~~

**The
Social Gospel**

UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

The Social Gospel

By
Shailer Mathews

Dean of the Divinity School, University of Chicago

AUTHOR

"The Church and the Changing Order"
"The Social Teaching of Jesus," etc.

Philadelphia
The Griffith & Rowland Press
Boston Chicago
St. Louis

LIBRARY

PACIFIC COLLEGE
WITHDRAWN
FRESNO 2, CALIFORNIA

~~UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY~~

~~UPLAND, CALIFORNIA~~

16212

Copyright 1910 by
A. J. ROWLAND, Secretary

Published February, 1910

261

MA42

S

PREFACE

IN this little volume I have not attempted to elaborate any social Utopia or to assume the position of a professional sociologist. My purpose has been rather to set forth the social teachings of Jesus and his apostles, as well as the social implications of the spiritual life. The main purpose of these studies is not to give technical instruction on the tremendous questions which confront us, but to define and stimulate the Christian attitude toward such questions. It is for this reason that I have so insisted upon the spiritual, rather than the economic, significance of our religion.

I would also like to emphasize the fact that the gospel is not a new group of laws, but an inspiring hope and promise for the future. Christian people ought to be made to realize this, in order to arouse their enthusiasm. It is one thing to do a duty, and another thing to grapple with difficulties because one feels joy in the undertaking. The gospel, in its bearings upon the salvation of society, is something more than a new Decalogue.

I suggest that in taking up these chapters, classes study the New Testament to find the scriptural basis for the teaching of Jesus and the apostles. I have purposely omitted many references, believing that one of the best methods of introducing young people to the thought of Jesus is a search for materials which would support or oppose the positions which I have taken. I have made no statement relative

to the teaching of Jesus or the apostles without a definite passage of Scripture in mind.

In the use of the "Quiz" it might be well for the leader to read the questions and expect the members of the society to answer them. "Questions for Further Study" are intended to introduce the student to the immediate application of principles he has been considering, and to stimulate him to observe social affairs, particularly the social work of religious bodies in his own community. Some of these questions might well be made the subjects for brief papers, to be read in the class as a means of opening up discussion.

It can hardly be expected that all of the positions taken in such a disputed field will meet with universal assent. It is to be hoped, however, that where dissent arises, it will be utilized by the class leader in the interest of discussion and, above all, investigation. Snap judgments and extemporaneously developed theories are less to be desired than convictions reached after the student has reasonably mastered the evidence in the case. But amid all differences of opinion, it should be borne in mind that among genuine Christians there can be no difference as to the fundamental conviction that the principles of Jesus must be put into our social life or they will be forever inoperative. No man should call him Lord who does not do the things which he commands.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	I. GENERAL PRINCIPLES	PAGE
	I. THE WORTH OF A MAN.....	11
	II. THE MESSAGE OF THE KINGDOM.....	18
	III. THE BASIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL	24
	II. THE FAMILY	
	IV. MARRIAGE	35
	V. DIVORCE	41
	VI. THE CHILD	47
	III. THE STATE	
	VII. GOVERNMENT	55
	VIII. WAR AND PEACE.....	63
	IX. SOCIAL CLASSES	70
	IV. ECONOMIC LIFE	
	X. WEALTH	81
	XI. THE RIGHTS OF THE POOR.....	88
	XII. THE DUTIES OF THE RICH.....	97
	XIII. THE CHURCH AND LABOR.....	106

CHAPTER	V. SOCIAL REGENERATION	PAGE
	XIV. THE SOCIAL FORCES IN THE GOSPEL..	117
	XV. PUNISHMENT	125
	XVI. REMEDIAL LEGISLATION	132
	XVII. EDUCATION	139
	XVIII. THE CHURCH	145
	XIX. MISSIONS	154
	XX. THE VICARIOUS TENTH OF SOCIETY....	161

Part I

General Principles of the Gospel

UP AND SOLOMON LIBRARY
1234567890

CHAPTER I

THE WORTH OF A MAN

JESUS has no social gospel for bad people. His ideals presuppose goodness. They are meaningless to men and women who are out of sympathy with God. That is why it is so hard to get the gospel actually at work throughout our social life. Sin is a fact that cannot be overlooked by social reformers any more than by any one else. It takes sound timber to make a sound ship; and it takes regenerate souls to make a regenerated society. The gospel is the message of a salvation assured to individuals and society who accept Jesus as their Lord.

Our study of the social aspect of the gospel will be wholly from this point of view. Christian ideals are for Christian people and demand Christian experience as a condition of success. If Jesus had been a social reformer or the founder of a State or a practical politician he would never have taught as he did. He would have compromised with many things. He had plenty of opportunity so to do. The Pharisees suggested it and his disciples wanted it, and Peter at Cæsarea Philippi urged it. But Jesus knew better. As the revelation of God and God's life in an age of sin, he could not compromise. He must teach the truth. And therefore to under-

stand and appreciate his words about our social relations and duties we must always bear in mind that they presuppose lives morally like that of Jesus himself. Jesus alone among men completely embodied his own ideals; but the true children of God, those who constitute the kingdom of God, will be like Jesus as the branch is like the vine.

Now, a moment's thought will make very clear that Jesus had a high opinion of the worth of men and women. They were worth dying for because they could be so much better than they were. Sinful though they were, hating and fighting and selfish and impure though they were, they were capable of having a life morally like God's. And so Jesus could teach how such new lives ought to live together. If they had been worth less and capable of less, it is hardly imaginable that he would have ventured to give men the teachings that come from him. He never preached to birds and animals. He preached to and he worked for souls. With God's help they could become godlike.

And they were separate, individual souls. Jesus did not work for the Jewish nation or the Roman empire or society as a whole. He worked first of all for souls—sinful men and women. The first great message of the social gospel is just this: men and women can be saved from sin each by himself or herself. Nobody has to wait for good legislation or good sewerage or good customs or good food or good times or a good world. Only think where

the Prodigal Son began—where the woman who anointed Jesus at the house of Simon began. If either had waited till society had been regenerated, they might be waiting to-day.

It is necessary to make this very clear before we go farther, or else we shall all the time be wondering whether the social teaching of Jesus is practicable. Let us speak plainly. The teaching of Jesus is not practicable for bad people—for those who are not possessed of a spirit like that of Jesus. And Jesus knew this. He distinguished sharply between the world and his disciples. They were not only opposed to each other, but they could not be treated alike. Only a man who is sinful, who is incapable of being worked into an ideal society, who, in a word, is everything Jesus is not, can be made loving, fit to seek for ideal social relations, by faith in God through Jesus. That, in general, is the social significance of that great work of God in a man's heart which the theologians have so well called "regeneration." It is this capacity that gives man his real worth as the image of God, sadly marred as that image may be.

This estimate of the dignity possible to the individual man is everywhere present in the New Testament. Jesus came to seek and save the lost. Paul counted himself a debtor to all men in that he possessed the news of a salvation that might be theirs. It made no difference how low or degraded a man or woman might be, their future was within their

own keeping. They had but to repent and believe on Jesus as the Christ to find themselves morally reenforced by God and made ready at least for education in the ideals of the truly Christian life. In comparison with this worth of the individual all other good things were as nothing, less than worthless. Wealth, honor, even wisdom, were secondary. Everything was to be tested by its relation to this supreme good.

But it should be noticed that this worth does not lie in the mere fact that a man is a man. That is no small matter, but the Christian estimate is something higher. To Jesus and Paul men and women were of supreme worth *because they could become something still better*: they could become children of God, joint heirs with Christ, possessed of his spirit. If such a great change were not possible, if they were always to be the sort of people they were and are, the estimate of the gospel would be quite too high.

There has been no little discussion as to whether the individual or society is the great end of all social development. From the Christian point of view there need be no hesitancy in the answer so far as man is concerned: the saved individual is the supreme end of the divine will. Only it is the *saved* individual; that is, one whose life is like God's as it appears in Jesus. And that, of course, means not a selfish, narrow, egotistic individualism, but one that is social, full of love and helpfulness, a life that finds

its proper expression only in the community of other lives like itself. In other words, there can be no real regenerate life that is anti-social. To use the dialect of the schools, the saved life must function socially or be lost. We shall see later what an inspiring and yet awful truth that is.

From this point of view it is worth while recalling how deeply Jesus was interested in persons who, he thought, could be brought into this sort of life. How keen he was to draw lives into friendship with each other and himself! Most of his sayings that the disciples remembered and preserved for us were spoken to individuals and not to crowds. He searched out human lives as the shepherd would search out a lost sheep. He described the divine joy at the recovery of one lost soul. Is it any wonder, therefore, that the church has also always taught, even when its members have not practised, the supreme worth of a man? Nor has it limited itself to the worth of rich and great or even thoroughly good men. Just because its Lord had taught it to see what a man might become, it took thought for the oppressed and the poor and the degraded. It ended much of the cruelties of the heathen world; it taught men to be kind to the unfortunate; to build hospitals and homes; it founded educational institutions; it helped to abolish slavery; it carried its own blessings across the seas to Africa and Asia. The church has not been perfect, but it has always been better than its times, and in nothing more than in

this recognition of the worth of a human soul in terms of a possible likeness to God. And this test it must still apply to social institutions, and this task of saving souls it must still fulfil, if our civilization is to continue to grow Christian. Once let this gospel message of the worth of a man in terms of his possible Christlikeness get possession of the world and social regeneration will follow. It cannot be otherwise. It will follow as naturally as the day follows the dawn.

But it will need and must have proper direction. There is many a good man who is not a wise citizen, and there are many earnest souls who are honestly trying to reform the world whose efforts are to be condemned. It is one characteristic of the gospel that it neither leaves a man without instruction nor imposes upon him a mass of legislation. Jesus does not merely urge men to become the children of God; he shows them how to live as children of God. His social teaching is a part of this instruction. So too, in the case of Paul and the other New Testament writers. They were not engaged in evolving fine-spun theories; they were rather concerned with showing people how they could live in a wicked age in accordance with the gospel; and so it will always be. Men and women are worth saving, but they cannot be saved without the fact showing itself in building up better social relations. It is a part of the worth of a man that these relations do thus spring from his religious nature.

Quiz

1. What is the prerequisite of a regenerated society? 2. What is the first great message of the social gospel? 3. How did Jesus value the individual? 4. In what does the supreme worth of an individual consist? 5. How can the social teachings of Jesus become practical? 6. Is the individual or society the end of social development? 7. How has the church manifested its interest in individuals? 8. How can we secure the regeneration of society?

Topics for Further Study

1. Give illustrations of Jesus' interest in individuals. 2. What evils would be abolished if all the world believed in the absolutely supreme worth of a human soul? 3. Would it be well if evangelists emphasized the social implications of the regenerate life? 4. How would you show that it is not selfish for a man to seek to be saved? 5. Why are the teachings of Jesus impracticable for bad people? Do you believe they are growing less or more practicable in our age?

CHAPTER II

THE MESSAGE OF THE KINGDOM

THE gospel, although addressed particularly to individuals, never assumes that men are to grow good by abandoning social life. Neither Jesus nor Paul believed that saints should turn hermits. Whenever the Christian church has taught to the contrary—as in the Middle Ages, and even now in some countries—it has been in opposition to its Founder. No man is really Christian, or as we have said, regenerate, who does not recognize his social obligations. He is not a mere unit; he is a part of society. And the gospel never overlooks this fact. For as Augustine long ago asked, “How could the city of God either take a beginning or be developed or attain its destiny, if the life of the saints were not a social life?”

The New Testament is full of the social ideal. There must be union to be spiritual life. A man is not merely to be saved *out* from an evil society—the world; he is to be saved *into* a good society—the kingdom of God.

This term, kingdom of God or of heaven, has an interesting history. It springs from the ancient belief of the Hebrews that Jehovah would reestablish their nation. No matter how oppressed and wicked

the prophets found their people, they foretold the coming of an age in which God would punish Israel's—and his own—enemies and establish a righteous Hebrew empire under the rule of a descendant of David.

As time went on, it became more evident that God must establish this kingdom miraculously if it ever was to be established. One nation after another conquered the little country of Judea and attempted to enforce its own laws. The Jews were scattered throughout the ancient world, as colonists, traders, magicians, and artisans. No people was ever in more desperate national plight. Yet Israel's hope never weakened. Rather did it seem to grow in intensity and religious faith. A new literature, that of the apocalypses, grew up portraying in striking symbols the glories of the new epoch that was to dawn. The Christ was sure to come and establish the kingdom of David. Jehovah would then reign forever over a glorious empire of Jews to which all the world would be subject.

This great hope of a very real kingdom Jesus used to induce men to follow him. He taught them about this kingdom they expected. Only he endeavored to make his hearers see that it was something more than a new kingdom of the Jews. It was to be a new social order, established by God, in which the relation of men to God would be like that of sons, and consequently to each other, that of brothers. All the blessings which could rightfully

be expected to come from God to mankind, he associated with membership in this kingdom. To belong to it was the greatest of blessings. It meant eternal life.

But some one will say that Jesus meant by the kingdom a state of the soul—something “within” us. Such a view is the outcome of the unhappy translation of the saying of Luke 17 : 20. But if one will carefully study that passage it will be plain that Jesus is speaking to the Pharisees, and that what he really meant was that the kingdom of God was among them ; that is, in the persons of himself and his followers.

Then too, some may think that by the kingdom of heaven the New Testament writers mean what we call “heaven.” And there is much truth in such a view. For it seems very plain that the really complete and perfect life, both individual and social, was believed by Jesus and by the writers of the New Testament to be possible only after the great change which we call the resurrection. Heaven is the absolute, ideal social order. And it is for the coming of this ideal that we pray when we say “Thy kingdom come.”

But in the teaching of Jesus there is another view concerning the kingdom. It is the gradual approach to this ideal through the association of men who possess the spirit of Christ. Jesus’ followers are to pray and to strive that God’s will be done on earth as it is in heaven. And the answer to this prayer

comes in the same proportion as Christian men and women influence the social life of their time. The new life in Christ cannot be content until it expresses itself in some form of united activity for the good of others. And the "good news" here is that this social life of the true Christian, this approach toward realizing the kingdom of God on earth, must at last be successful. There can be no complete salvation of the individual apart from the heavenly kingdom; there can be no process of working out our salvation with God's help, except we bring God into increasing control of the politics, the industry, the domestic life of the world. Such control can never be absolute as long as sin is in society, but it can be made ever more complete. Such a conception to the practical politician may seem an iridescent dream, but to the Christian it is sober reality. It is the call of Christ's spirit in all Christians to bring these ideals of Jesus into social life.

But they must be brought by Christians who first of all are themselves embodying these ideals in their own lives. The Christian must become the nucleus of the new social order; he must be the leaven that shall tend to recreate the world in which he lives. Such a duty is imperative. We all can see only too plainly how dependent is every individual upon the social influences in the midst of which he lives. How easy it is for those who grow up in a city's slums to become criminal. Evil surroundings corrupt good manners. One great reason for the

Christian's interest in social matters is just here. We are so bound up in the bundle of other people's lives that evil forces are liable to pervert an entire community. Safety for the individual lies in a widespread diffusion of Christian principles throughout all the world in which we live. Thus, though it is true, as has already been said, that the Christlike individual is the final goal of all progress; it is just as true that such an individual is impossible except in connection with the kingdom of God. No selfish man can be saved until he quits his selfishness. He who would study the social gospel, must, therefore, not study it as legal enactment, but as a divine ideal, the way to which is made practicable through the revelation by Jesus of the nature of the life with God, both individually and socially.



Quiz

1. How is society necessary to Christian living?
2. How did the term "The kingdom of heaven" originate?
3. What did Jesus mean by the kingdom? What did he not mean?
4. How will "working out our salvation" affect domestic and social life?
5. Should we permit our salvation in its out-working to affect political life?
6. If political life is to be affected by Christian ideals, where must that influence start?
7. How will debasing surroundings affect Christian character?
8. How does the social gospel promise the well-being of the individual?

Questions for Further Study

1. To what does Jesus compare the kingdom of God with reference to (1) its progress, (2) its triumph, (3) its value? 2. Illustrate the influence which society has on people in your own community. 3. Illustrate, if possible, from your own observation, the good influence on society of a thoroughly Christian individual. 4. Which is more loyal to Christ, to withdraw from evil surroundings or to endeavor to transform them? 5. Is the gospel a message of salvation only of the individual? If not, can the church be indifferent to the moral issues involved in business, amusements, politics, and other social activities?

CHAPTER III

THE BASIC SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF THE GOSPEL

As has already been said, Jesus was not a sociologist. His interest is not primarily in society, but in individuals who are to live socially. The difference in his attitude and that of a sociologist will be apparent to any one who reads a treatise on society or any of its phases. Yet, from the very beginning of Christian history, the gospel has had its social influences, and men have repeatedly attempted to embody its principles in legislation. In this they have been successful in the same proportion that there has been Christian sentiment in the community to which the legislation applied. It would be difficult to misinterpret Jesus more completely than to regard him as setting forth sociological theories; but he would be misinterpreted quite as completely if one were to overlook his constant reiteration of principles which must have social results. These principles are the chief elements in the Christian character.

The first of these three has already been implied in what has been said concerning the worth of the individual and the kingdom of God. It is now time, however, to state it more explicitly. It is the principle of *love*.

Jesus himself recognized this as the one great con-

tribution which he made to inspired teaching. He gave his disciples a new commandment to love one another. Yet the newness of the commandment does not lie in its mere words. The Old Testament is full of exhortations and commandments to love. Jesus himself, when asked what was the greatest commandment, replied in words taken from Deut. 6 : 4: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Mark 12 : 30, 31) The element of novelty in Jesus' commandment lies in the fact that with him love is not co-ordinate with any other commandment, but is all-inclusive.

Now, this love which Jesus insists upon is something more than mere affection or mere "liking" some one. The Christian can love people whom he does not like. Christian love is a matter of the will more than of the feelings. The Christian can, and if he is really to be Christlike, he must, love his enemies. That is to say, he must treat them not as those who are doing him wrong, but in the same way in which he treats those for whom he has an actual affection. How far-reaching this principle becomes, is a part of the revelation made by Jesus himself in his death. That was the culmination of his supreme love for even those who brought him to the cross. Whatever else Christian love includes—and it includes very many other things—this element of service to the point of complete self-sacrifice

is supreme. No man is possessed of the Christ spirit who is without it, and it is not too much to say that the one great test of the regenerated life which Jesus would make is this love. If a man does not forgive men their trespasses, Jesus says explicitly that God will not forgive his trespasses. God is love, and to be like him is to be loving. That is what Jesus means by our "becoming children of God."

But a study of Jesus' life and of Christian history as well, shows that such love as this is not hostile to justice. Punishment may be and sometimes is its expression. Jesus certainly did not hesitate to rebuke the Pharisees for their perversion of their own religious principles. Some of the severest denunciations of other sins are also to be found in his words. Love, however, will prevent justice from degenerating into revenge, either in the individual life or in social activity. It will prevent righteous people from growing bitter even in their denunciation of sin. In the same proportion as one tries to make this spirit regulative in one's life will this danger be obviated. The same will be true also in the case of social activity. Wherever love is made dominant we shall find the principle of sacrifice present and the desire to give justice as truly as to get justice.

A second principle of the social gospel is, therefore, the principle of *fraternity*. "All ye are brethren" is the way in which Jesus described the relation of his disciples. But this fraternity is not based

on men being men. It is the outcome of true sonship of God. Real fraternity must be Christian. The difference between love and fraternity is the difference between a quality of soul and one of the ways in which that quality expresses itself in conduct. Very many men think they are possessed of love while they follow economic and political practices which are unfraternal. They may love others as their superiors. Thus a master could love a slave. Fraternity is love expressed in social action, which involves the recognition of the equality of human life, of the worth of mankind, in the same way as Jesus recognized that worth. The tendency among many men is to love one another in a condescending fashion. As Jesus said, among the heathen, men were called benefactors who exercised lordship over others; but it was not so to be among his disciples. They were not to regard themselves as superior to others or as inferior to others. They had only one Master; they were all brethren. So too, Paul in developing his magnificent estimate of the church insists that while the body of Christ has many members and they do not all perform the same offices, yet they are all equal in the sense that they are members of the same body. The one Spirit of God is in them all. One member is not to lord it over the others, for the head of the body is Christ.

But this noble truth of the fraternity of those who are the children of God cannot be limited in its practical working simply to the church. It is true

that it would be overlooking certain fundamental differences to say that the man who persists in sin is equal to the man in whom the Spirit of God is really living. For sin is the great unequalizing force in society, and one of its most persistent forces is selfishness, and selfishness consists in making one's own advantages superior to those of other people. But the Christian cannot treat those who treat him unfraternally in any spirit but that of fraternity. The attitude of the elder brother toward the prodigal can never be his so long as he trusts the impulses of the Christian experience. Whether it be in the family or in politics or in business, this principle of Jesus must always be operative. True, the Christian is not to cast his pearls before swine, but he is not to treat other people in any way different from that in which he would like to be treated himself. Thus, in whatever sphere he may act, whether it be in his capacity as citizen, as husband, or as a neighbor, he will bring into social life this fraternal spirit. That is the only possible meaning of the "Golden Rule."

A third principle of the social gospel is that *God himself is bringing in the better social order*. Too often we forget that God is really working in human affairs. In our emphasis upon our own obligation to serve him we are often tempted to forget that God is working with us to will and to do of his good pleasure. To Jesus, history was full of God's presence. His Father was still working. And this has been the inspiration of every soul who has fairly grasped

the message which Jesus brought the world. As one looks out over our modern life he sees in it much that is evil; much that suggests discouragement if not despair. Multitudes seem oblivious to the principle of love and fraternity and seem to be seeking only present and personal advantage. Little children are sacrificed to commercial success, the weaker are crowded to the wall, thousands of human lives are being born into conditions which make it all but certain that they will grow up to be criminals. And on the other hand, the work of the church seems sometimes ineffective in bringing about changes for the better.

The gospel is a message of hope for such moments of discouragement. God is in his world. The world may be full of sin and oppression and injustice, but God has not abandoned it; he loves it and has given his Son to save it. That is the source of the Christian's hope. He is not working desperately, uncertain of ultimate success. He is working with God and God must bring in his own kingdom. The task before the Christian is therefore spiritual, as truly as sociological. He is to let God work through him and he is to work with God in this creation of a better social order. To do this he is to follow those spiritual impulses toward love and justice which he feels in his own soul. For these impulses are one way which God has of bringing in his kingdom. Fraternity is possible because God helps us to be brothers by making us his sons.

And God works in other ways in human history. The psalmist was right when he said: "He makes the wrath of man to praise him." Again and again it has been true that God has worked in society, so far as we can see, wholly apart from Christian men. In fact, it is hard to believe that there are any such things as accidents in human history. But the gospel will work most effectively through evangelized and transformed human lives. God lays the responsibility upon such lives of acting wisely and co-operatively. They are the leaven, the light of the world. The ideals of Jesus embodied in the church will spread throughout society; the Spirit of God in Christianity can work to the regeneration of a world of cruelty and selfishness and sin, both individually and socially.

Quiz



1. What are the three principles of the social gospel? 2. In what way does Jesus differ from a sociologist? 3. What is the greatest commandment? and why? 4. What is it to be godlike? 5. How might a man love his enemies? 6. How does love act in respect to sin and wrong? 7. Describe "fraternity" as it is taught in the New Testament. 8. What is the great encouragement in all social work?

Questions for Further Study

1. Give illustrations of the manner in which Jesus exemplified the principle of sacrificing love. 2. How

did the early Christians in Jerusalem exemplify the principle of fraternity? 3. Do you see any difference between the two petitions of the Lord's Prayer: "Thy kingdom come" and "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"? 4. Do you think there are evidences of God's work in American history? If so, indicate some of them. 5. Have you ever tried to put the Golden Rule into literal operation? What success did you have? 6. Do you think a man can live the Christian life and cherish a grudge against his neighbor? 7. What do you think of the saying, "I can forgive but I cannot forget"?

Part II

The Family

CHAPTER IV

MARRIAGE

ON no subject has human thought more centered than upon the family. There is nothing more important in our entire social life. For a nation will not be better than its homes.

Christianity did not invent the family or marriage, but it has been probably the greatest agency in giving ideals to the home. This is all the more remarkable when one recalls that Jesus was not married, and that so much of the New Testament literature was written by Paul who, like his Master, had no home. But how incomplete would the gospel be without the figures drawn from fatherhood, sonship, marriage, and childhood. The more one reads the New Testament the more does one feel how sacred the family is because it so often serves as a symbol of the relations of the church with Christ. When the New Testament writers wish to express the very closest and holiest union of believers with their Lord it is to the family to which they turn for symbols.

In order to make this more apparent it is worth while pausing to recall how much of a contrast there is between such use of the figure and some of the conceptions current in Jesus' own day. Both among the Jews and the Romans the family was of impor-

tance, but in the Roman world there were practices prevalent which are altogether inconsistent with the purity of the family. Some of the noblest Greek and Roman writers discuss, with no apparent sense of any moral issue, subjects which would not even be mentioned in a Christian society. The private morals of the Romans and the Greeks may not have been so black as some writers have painted them, but they were far enough from being in accordance with the teaching of Jesus. With him the relation of the sexes was a matter not merely of conventional morality, but one demanding deepest spiritual purity. Similarly Paul, although he discusses the matter in a different way from Jesus, raises all such matters into the same spiritual realm. The Christian's body was the temple of the Holy Spirit and it was to be kept undefiled. Such ideals as he sets forth in his letter to the Corinthians, while practically and immediately intended to apply to men and women living in a heathen community where licentiousness was prevalent and all but unrebuked, are also of lasting significance, for they are implied by the very quality of life that the Christian should possess.

Further, while as far as we know, neither Jesus nor his apostles were students of the history of marriage, it is interesting to see how their positions are those the modern sociologist has come to recognize. For Jesus is not content even with the position taken in the Mosaic legislation as interpreted by the Pharisees. Marriage with him was not the outcome of

law, nor was it established by lawgivers. It was, he said, created by God in the beginning. Marriage became thus, in his teaching, one of the ultimate facts of human life, one of those institutions which we have come to see distinguish humanity from the lower animals.

And it cannot be overlooked that Jesus sees in this divinely established relationship not the polygamy of the earlier people, but the monogamy which our sociologists are teaching us is the final characteristic of the family. "The twain," he said, "become one flesh." The early church embodied the same conception in its social ideals, and throughout the history of Christianity there has never been the slightest wavering on the part of great Christian teachers at this point. Marriage is sacred—not a social incident. How important a bearing this has upon the question of divorce will appear in the course of our discussion. It is enough now to emphasize the fact that in the establishment of the family Jesus thus recognized the work of God and forever made it holy.

As civilization has developed and grown prosperous it has been only too frequent that tendencies have arisen which have made against this conception. Men and women have lost sight of those fundamental principles which must rule in all social relations if they are to be in any sense Christian, and almost invariably the first breaking of the highest morality has been in the region of the family. The relations of the sexes have grown unhallowed, and

the family, as an institution, has been disregarded. In our own day we see altogether too many indications of this tendency. The greatest enemy which besets the Christian family at the present time is the liability that it should be regarded from the heathen rather than from the Christian point of view; that all the sanctity which Christ and his church have given the institution should be lessened if not destroyed.

All these dangers we do not need to mention, but some of them cannot be overlooked. There is, for example, the haste and carelessness with which marriage is entered upon; and the almost precisely opposite danger which arises from the belief that young people cannot be married and establish a family unless they have a large enough income to live in a certain "style." Along with these two dangers are those which come from the increasing opportunities which women are finding open to them to enter industrial life and become wage-earners. In some cases these opportunities result in an unwillingness on the part of both men and women to assume the responsibilities which accompany a family, and as a result there is growing up a large number of young people who do not intend to marry. In other cases—and these are far more serious—the family suffers from the work of women in factories. Students of society are just now particularly concerned with this danger. One of the duties which the Christian citizen must undertake is

the establishment of legislation which on the one side shall not exclude women from industry and on the other side shall protect women and children from the dangers, both moral and physical, which such employment involves.

Any reform looking to the elimination of these dangers which threaten the stability of the family must be undertaken wisely, but it must none the less be undertaken. It is plain that no civilization can continue in its best form if they are to continue and increase. To correct these dangers we must look to something more powerful than mere law about marriage and divorce. The situation is too complicated with the industrial reorganization to be so easily met. We must look to a public opinion dominated by the principles of the gospel. And such a public opinion will depend largely on the work of the Christian church.



Quiz

1. How did Jesus regard marriage 2. How do Jesus' views of marriage compare with those of modern sociologists? 3. How has civilization frequently affected our conception of marriage? 4. What letter from St. Paul gives fundamental principles regarding personal purity? What dangers in our social life confront the home? 6. How does the industrial world affect marriage? 7. What is the Christian duty in respect to legislation to pro-

tect women and children? 8. Is legislation sufficient to protect the family?

Questions for Further Study

1. Gather such information as we have in the New Testament relative to the family life of Jesus. 2. How many of the apostles were married? 3. Do you think parents ought to compel their children to go to church? 4. Do you think that theater posters are injurious to public morals? If so, how would you go about to correct the evil? 5. Do all the customs at weddings tend to increase the view of the sanctity of the family? 6. Should family prayers be maintained by Christians? 7. What would you suggest as to some of the best means by which our family life can be made more Christian?

CHAPTER V.

DIVORCE

THE proper approach to this very delicate and difficult subject is through the family as an institution. From Jesus' point of view of the sanctity and divine origin of the family as a social institution, his position as to divorce is inevitable. As law did not create marriage, so it cannot break it. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

This general principle Jesus carries out into detail more than is customary in his teaching. There are many subjects upon which the world has sought his elaborated opinion, only to be disappointed; but in the matter of marriage and divorce he carries his instruction out into the nearest approach which he ever makes to actual legislation. The marriage union is never to be broken unless, possibly, through the unfaithfulness of one of the parties (Matt. 5 : 32; 19 : 9).

This radical teaching of Jesus is even more marked when one recalls that it was in express opposition to the trend of custom among the Jews. The Semitic nations never regarded divorce of the wife by the husband as a very difficult matter. In the time of Jesus the custom was growing more frequent, as the more liberal rabbis made the grounds

of divorce ever more numerous. More than that, Jesus' words were addressed explicitly to those who asked him concerning the rightfulness of divorce. The only conclusion that can be safely drawn is that Jesus regarded marriage as such a final union of two lives as to be indissoluble, barring the one possible exception.

But one must not mistake here. To treat this one exception as justifying the easy-going divorce legislation of the present day is absurd. Even more absurd would it be to insist that Jesus commended a divorce under any circumstances. His reply to the Sadducees was, it is true, a recognition of the legitimacy of the Mosaic legislation concerning divorce, but even then only as a compromise with the divine order. Remarriage of divorced persons he regarded as adultery. The ideal of the family which he sets up is evidently one which is practicable in a strict sense only among those who conform to the Christian conception of human relations.

Clearly there is in the social gospel no justification of the perversion of family relations exhibited in our divorce courts. The place of cure, however, does not lie in such courts, but in the home itself. Divorce between Christian husband and wife should not even be mentioned. The principle of love, which would lead a man to leave his offering at the altar until he had become reconciled to his brother, is certainly applicable to the Christian family. And

far more than is usually believed, the same principle will hold among those who do not claim to be disciples of Jesus. Whatever exceptional cases may arise, the fundamental principles of Jesus in application to the family life would prevent divorce and maintain the family.

In order to establish a home that shall be permanent and indissoluble, it is necessary to rely upon something more than social conventions. They are, of course, helpful and in some cases serve as admirable social buttresses. It is highly desirable that unjustifiable divorce should subject its parties to social loss. But as the experience of the church of Corinth shows, social customs are not to be substituted for Christian principles. Back of all customs there must be the purity of life that maintains the sanctity of marriage in the heart. To commit adultery therein is in some particulars as monstrous a crime as open breaking of the marriage laws; and it is scarcely less dangerous to marriage as an institution. The Christian citizen will do well to guard against all the incitements both of the theater and of literature, of dress and of custom, which prompt to that dissolution of the marriage tie which results from the perverted soul. Here, as in all social relations, the Christian is concerned primarily with the quality of life. Out from life itself flows that which either establishes or destroys social institutions.

No modification of this position is to be based

on the teaching of Jesus that, sacred as the family really is, marriage is, after all, only physical, intended for an age of physical existence. "In the resurrection," says Jesus, "there is to be no marriage." No one can interpret such a view as in any way a reflection on the sanctity of the institution. Jesus never thought about so-called "soul marriages." At most he is here simply emphasizing the difference between the two modes of life which are implied in the differences between two ages. It would be altogether illegitimate to infer that he would admit divorces among his disciples in case of so-called "incompatibility of temper" or the destruction of conjugal love. Neither of these unfair interpretations falls within the possible exception already noted to his general teaching. Jesus would urge that a family once founded upon love is to be maintained by the maintenance of that love. The more danger there is of that passing, the more effort should be made to retain it. Reconciliation and spiritual unity are two elementary expressions of that love, which is a precondition of all Jesus' social teaching. In other words, divorce is impossible in the persistently and genuinely Christian home. And such a home should be the model for all others.

How far these Christian ideals should be involved in legislation is, and is likely to be always, a matter of some dispute. But this much is clear: All legislation protecting the family should move in the direc-

tion of the ideal set by Jesus. In the same proportion as the public mind becomes filled with the spirit of the gospel will this become inevitable. Even if complete recognition and realization of the ideals of Jesus for the family are possible only among those whose lives are embodying the spirit of Jesus, a society controlled by absolutely unchristian ideals as to the family is incredible. It would fall to pieces in the home. Yet, we should probably all admit that, as long as sin is harmful, some allowance is rightly made by law for the protection of its victims in the family. For this seems recognized by Jesus in his estimate of the Mosaic permission of divorce. The great principle of love would not permit society to leave either member of a family at the mercy of a dangerous life-partner. To-day, as in the time of Moses, an absolute ideal can be only to some extent approximated because of sin, which sometimes makes the sacrifice of ideals necessary in legislation. But this is at best a departure from the ideals of the gospel. If men and women were all that they should be, it would be unneeded. In our practical legislation this concession to the needs of the injured party should not be made into a principle. The progress of the gospel should make it unnecessary. For in such progress the sanctity of the family would never come into question, and we should be free from one growing habit—to overlook divorce and allow full social privileges to those divorced on unscriptural grounds. The

gospel has higher ideals for the family than has the divorce court.



Quiz

1. What was Jesus' attitude on the subject of divorce? 2. Why did Jesus take so strong a position against divorce? 3. What was the tendency of Semitic nations in the days of Jesus? 4. What conditions are prerequisite to the realization of Jesus' ideal of the family? 5. Are the conventions of society a sufficient guide for Christians? With what must they be reenforced? 6. Explain Jesus' words in Matt. 22 : 30. 7. Why did Jesus justify the permission for divorce in the Mosaic law? 8. Can you justify divorce to-day?

Questions for Further Study

1. State in your own words Jesus' teaching as to the permanence of the family. 2. Is divorce increasing, or diminishing in your own town? 3. Do you think it is advisable for clergymen to remarry divorced people, or should that be left to the civil authorities? 4. Would you think it advisable to forbid divorce altogether except for marital unfaithfulness? 5. How far do you think the ideal of the family suffers from joking about divorce and from reading stories that tend to favor it? 6. Just how would you go to work to create a better public opinion in regard to the family?

CHAPTER VI

THE CHILD

JESUS never experienced the responsibilities and the joys of parenthood. His wonderful analogies of the fatherliness of God were derived from his own experience as a son in the family at Nazareth. This fact is significant from almost any point of view, but particularly from that of a discussion concerning the child. Jesus, it is true, has little to say about children; but this little has lifted childhood from the position given it by Jewish and Roman legislation into a type of the true disciple, a member of the kingdom of God. In fact, that affection with which Jesus uses the terms drawn from family life, would have demanded some recognition of the child if for nothing else than for its own completeness. And Christianity has not neglected its Master's words and attitude. The Christian church looks back to the cradle and worships the Holy Child; it loves to think of Christ blessing the little ones; its constant reading of the words of Jesus has unconsciously tended to dignify the position of the young; and so it has come to pass that the child has shared in that progress made certain as the gospel has affected legislation regarding the family. The child in a Christian civilization, and particularly the

child in the Christian home, is probably the most ideally located person in all the world. He has the care of loving parents; he reaps full fruitage of the Christian life and love, and of the joys of a Christian home; he will be educated and helped into lifework by the sacrifices of his parents. And all this has come in large measure because the teaching of Jesus has ruled in the minds of his followers.

Yet we cannot leave the discussion of the child here. The Christian principles of love and fraternity, which are embodied in the Christian family, must be extended in full measure to the entire range of social life in which children are vitally concerned.

Child labor, for instance, can be properly controlled and limited only as these Christian principles are embodied in legislation, the programmes of employing classes, and in the lives of parents. Admittedly it is an exceedingly puzzling and complicated question. There are at the present time approximately two million boys and girls under the age of fifteen in the United States who are wage-earners, and the number is increasing because of the development of industries in which children can be employed.

It is indeed true that there are certain ameliorating facts which in a certain sense reduce the seriousness of the situation. It is becoming increasingly common for employers to establish schools where boys and girls in their employ can

receive instruction. In many States legislation is already operative, regulating the number of hours in which children shall labor and the ages under which they shall not be employed. But the evils associated with child labor are such as to startle all students of society. Physical and mental deterioration increasing in successive generations; moral temptations difficult to overcome; specific economic difficulties which do not need to be discussed here relative to wages both of the individual and the family; the right of the child to proper physical surroundings, education, and play—all these are involved in this growing practice.

Child labor was not discussed by Jesus any more than were many specific evils which exist to-day. But the principles which he enunciated will certainly bear upon the situation. The church must here again appeal to the consciences of Christians. In co-operation with reformers and labor unions the church can create a public sentiment which will influence both legislation and business. But such influence must be primarily in the realm of morals, and not in the realm of economics, as such. It is the duty of the church as an institution to educate Christians to see that reform is a moral issue. It is the duty of Christians to attend to ways and means to secure that end.

Another application of the general position of Jesus relative to the family is to be seen in the obligation of parents to train their children in

morals and religion. There is constant temptation for fathers and mothers to transfer such duties to the Sunday-school or the day-school, particularly the former. Important as is its work, the Sunday-school can hardly be expected to replace the family. Unless God is recognized in the home, the child is not likely to grow up God-fearing. There are few church-members that do not come from homes where at least one parent is a Christian. But the alarming fact is that many Christians are ceasing to have a family religion. The custom of holding family prayers is declining. Boys and girls grow up in Christian homes and hear little concerning religion beyond what they receive at Sunday-school and an occasional attendance on the services at church. The result is, that although many associations are working to hold young men and women to their church relations, the religious life of our time is being detached from the family. Clearly enough such a tendency is contrary to the attitude of Jesus. If the kingdom of God is to be like a great family; if its members are to be like little children, then certainly it would seem that the family itself should be a center of religious influence and interest.

And, finally, it would seem imperative that the entire education of the child should be inspired by religion. Christian people have the right to expect that their children should be educated into Christian faith rather than away from Christian

faith. In the same proportion as Christian ideals have operated in society have they resulted in the establishment of educational opportunities. The next step to be taken must be the extension of the moral and religious training into the educational method itself, so that the child shall not grow up with sharpened wits and dulled conscience.



Quiz

1. How did Jesus get his conception of fatherhood? 2. Explain why Jesus said so little about children. 3. Compare Jesus' thought of childhood with that of Jewish and Roman legislation. 4. How has Christianity in practice affected child life? 5. How many boys and girls under fifteen are wage-earners in the United States? 6. Name some things that are being done to help working children. 7. What are the chief evils that result from child labor? 8. What part should the church take in this reform?

Questions for Further Study

1. Which seems to you to be the more important, the infant Jesus or the man Christ? 2. Have you ever had any experience with child labor? If so, would you make a distinction between child labor on a farm and child labor in a factory? 3. Do you think it possible for legislation to improve the condition of children who have to work? 4. If no

children were allowed to work, would it be possible to give employment to men and women in their places? 5. What is the best way to interest young people in religion? 6. Why do so many young people leave the Sunday-school without joining the church?

Part III

The State

CHAPTER VII

GOVERNMENT

It will be recalled that the term "kingdom of God" had its origin in a political conception. Jehovah was to be the king of a real nation and the Christ was to be his political representative. It would be natural therefore, to expect that, when the term was used by Jesus and his apostles, it would retain something of this political meaning. But this is by no means the case. The New Testament conception of the kingdom is less that of a State than of a family.

Christians have always been tempted to make their religion a phase of politics. We do not need to look farther back than to the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay to discover how easy it is for Church and State to become united. As we all know, the Puritans were seeking religious liberty for themselves and the opportunity for worshiping God in such ways as they saw fit. They thought their town government should help them. If we go farther back than the seventeenth century, we find the entire history of Europe marked by efforts to find a basis of political theory and practice in the teaching of Jesus. These efforts were due to the feeling that everything in which the church was

interested should have some sort of scriptural basis; and for that reason the history of the Middle Ages is full of references to the "two swords" (Luke 22 : 38). Almost all the reformers of the sixteenth century were carried over into politics; in some cases, even very radical political views were supported by appeals to scriptural authority.

The fundamental saying of Jesus, to which almost all these various theories of a Christian State are reducible, is the reply of Jesus to the inquiry as to whether it was lawful to give tribute to Cæsar (Matt. 22 : 18-22), "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Yet it would be an exceedingly ingenious interpreter who could discover from this answer of Jesus any political theory whatsoever. The situation in which Jesus was placed makes it difficult to see in his answer anything but a refusal to commit himself to political teaching. His opponents were endeavoring to force him to say something which would enable them to bring about his arrest. But he thwarted their efforts by throwing back upon them the decision as to whether the use of a coin actually implied sovereignty, and by insisting upon their religious as well as their admitted political duties. That was all.

Nor is it possible to find in the New Testament any teaching which commits the gospel to any particular theory of government. Jesus himself was a good citizen, never undertaking to violate the laws.

Indeed, even at his arrest, when it would have been easy for him to cause, or at least permit his disciples to organize an armed revolt, he distinctly rebuked Peter when he attempted to defend him with a sword. Throughout his trial he observed scrupulously the rights of those in authority, as well as those which law and custom gave him as defendant. Yet, as in those earlier days when the people sought to make him a king, he refused to permit himself to be misjudged as a political agitator. His kingdom was not of this world. The fact that he suffered as "the King of the Jews" was only a grim bit of irony on the part of Pilate, who himself declined to find any real political significance in his prisoner.

This was true in the case of the other Christians. They steadily refused to treat the gospel as revolutionary propaganda. Paul and Peter alike bade the Christians be loyal to the State, and not forget that authorities—meaning thereby the emperor and his officials—were established by divine authority. The Christians were good citizens. Expecting as they did the coming of a glorious kingdom that should replace the kingdom of the emperors, they yet obeyed the laws of the empire during the period of awaiting its appearance. There is something stirring in the call of Peter to the earlier Christians to appear before the courts only for "the name," and not as lawbreakers. Indeed, Paul had already taught the Corinthian Christians that they were to keep out from the courts and settle their quarrels by

themselves. Neither Peter nor Paul ever spoke a word that could fairly be said to be revolutionary. In fact, the entire attitude of the Christian community was politically conservative.

This refusal of Jesus and the apostles to identify the gospel with some form of political reform has been often misrepresented. On the one side, men have said that Jesus was an anarchist, and that the gospel sets forth as the ideal of human society a philosophical anarchy. Such an opinion requires no very serious attention. It hardly requires more than to be stated to be rejected. Jesus was no more an anarchist because he did not talk about politics than he was a Christian Scientist because he did not speak about medicine. The heart of the matter is that both he and the apostles very wisely separated the gospel as a message of divine deliverance from any political programme. To have done otherwise would have been to imperil the very existence of the church.

And yet it is very easy to err on the opposite side, and to say that because Jesus does not give explicit political teaching the gospel has no bearing upon politics. But how can such a claim be true if the gospel, as has been said, is fundamentally a message of the possibility of fraternity to be brought about by God through the agency of Christian lives? How can a man really embody the spirit of Jesus and attempt to live out his new life without finding himself face to face with the prob-

lem of applying the principles of Jesus to his actions as a citizen? Or, to put it more briefly, how can any one expect to live a Christian life without finding good citizenship implied by its principles?

True, we wish to dissociate the Church and the State. The history of the last thousand years shows only too plainly the dangers which lie in a union of these two great institutions. In such a partnership, liberty of thought and liberty of conscience would be impossible. An ecclesiastic in control of the State would be as unendurable as a politician in control of the Church.

Yet this is by no means the same as saying that politics and religion are to be kept apart. The more one thinks about it the more impossible does such divorce seem. It is only too obvious that, if there is to be good legislation, there must be good people among the governed. If public opinion has any significance, a public opinion existing among Christians cannot help expressing itself to some degree at least in the Christianization of legislation. We can already see what this can accomplish in certain reforms which Christian people have been brave and wise enough to undertake. But the work of extending into politics the great principles of Christianity has only begun. It will go on with ever-increasing rapidity as we come to see the social implications of our religious professions. What the gospel would bring to men is a quality of life in the individual that shall express itself in

all social relations in accordance with its own Christlike ideals. And this means paying just taxes, sharing in political campaigns, and holding office when duty points in that direction.

The basis of the Christian's interest in politics is not, therefore, some definite word of Jesus or Paul, but rather the very genius of the gospel. It is a part of the wisdom of the divine revelation made through Jesus that he left us no political theory. In the development of politics since his day there have been innumerable changes both in theory and in practice. Statutes that would have applied specifically to the Roman empire would have been very difficult to apply in a republic like that of the United States. But the gospel has had, and always will have, political power through the political activity of Christian people. It is not committed to any particular form of government. Sometimes the church has insisted upon an empire; at other times on the absolute sovereignty of a king; at other times upon a constitutional monarchy, and sometimes upon a democracy. But a government is not Christian because it is of this or that form. While it is true that wherever the gospel is really operative the conception of the worth of the individual man has so developed that the tendency is toward democracy, Christianity, as such, has no more a political programme than had Jesus. Left free, therefore, to choose such political forms and institutions as seem wisest, the Christian is subject to

only one fundamental decision: Does this reform or institution or policy tend to extend into human relations those fundamental principles which are already existing in Christian experience? Do they tend to make it easier to give and get justice; do they tend toward the elemental virtues which condition the permanence of human history; do they, in a word, tend toward fraternity and the production of lives and institutions through which the will of God can be done on earth as it is done in heaven? It may be true that in some political situations it will be difficult to return an unconditional answer to these questions; but a political decision is Christian and in accordance with the gospel in the same proportion as one believes that the party or policy or official for which or whom he votes will carry God's will into political institutions and life. A Christianity that does not extend to good citizenship is contrary to the example of Jesus, the words of his apostles, and the spirit of the gospel.



Quiz

1. Explain the origin of the term "kingdom of God." 2. What is the New Testament idea of the "kingdom of God"? 3. Why did politics and religion become entangled in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries? 4. What was Jesus' view about religion and political relations? 5. Describe Jesus as a citizen. 6. What does the New Testament

teach as to the Christian's duty in the State? 7. If the Church is an institution entirely separate from the State, how is it to affect the State? 8. In what will the Christian find the basis for his interest in politics?

Questions for Further Study

1. What seems to you to be the form of government most in accord with the principles of Jesus? 2. What are some of the dangers which come from the union of Church and State? 3. Why did Jesus refuse to be a king? 4. Would the same reasons prevent a Christian man from going into politics? 5. Why were the apostles so little interested in political reform? 6. Does their action give you an example to follow in this particular? 7. If you had absolute power in a State, what would be the three most important laws you would try to enforce for the welfare of your subjects? 8. Is the church of political importance in a democracy?

CHAPTER VIII

WAR AND PEACE

GOVERNMENT is something more than a huge policeman. It must needs carry on a great many enterprises which are really of the nature of business—such, for example, as the post-office, the schools, water works, and various other public utilities. In all such matters, the Christian is deeply concerned; for nothing is more needed than the moral transformation of the social mind through the infusion of Christian ideals. But the moral problems in such phases of government are to a considerable degree without specific teachings of Jesus. It is, however, different in the case of war. Jesus and the apostles have indicated explicitly what is the Christian's attitude toward every form of violence.

The fundamental thought of Jesus here is that of reconciliation, the outcome of the spirit of love. It is only the reverse of such a positive principle when we find him insisting that his disciples should not quarrel. In his vivid way, Jesus puts this matter unforgetably. If a man strikes you on one cheek, do not attempt to "get even" with him by getting into a fight. Let him strike you on the other cheek. If a man compels you to go with him a mile, do not fight with him. Go with him two. If a man

goes to law and takes away your coat, do not fight with him; let him take your overcoat.

Now, it is hardly to be expected that sober-minded persons should regard these vivid teachings of Jesus as intended to be taken with legalistic literalness. Jesus is fond of this striking way of teaching, as when he tells a man to pluck out his eye rather than let it offend him, or cut off his right hand rather than it should do what is wrong. Such statements are emphatic expositions of the fundamental principles of love, fraternity, and godlikeness. It is as if Jesus would say: So precious are love and fraternity; so impossible is it for God to work constructively through men who are angry, and revengeful, that it is better even to sacrifice one's individual rights than to lose these absolute goods in life.

To erect such sayings into a social philosophy of non-resistance under all conditions is ill-advised. Every specific saying of Jesus must be interpreted as it radiates from a central teaching. Non-resistance to evil might be sometimes the greatest of crimes. The church of Jesus Christ is to be something more than a mere ambulance corps. It is to prevent evil, just as truly as it is to help people who have been injured by evil. Jesus assailed the Pharisees, not revengefully or with material weapons, it is true; but certainly any really absolute principle of non-resistance must cover the tongue as well as the fist. If Christians are to give up all

opposition to that which is evil in society, and stop fighting the white-slave traffic, dishonesty, the social evil, they will not only be untrue to their duties as citizens, but they will be just as untrue to that inner life which is theirs because they are Christians, for they will be stifling the impulse to be fraternal. Absolute non-resistance might be workable among Christians; but it would be so because in a perfect kingdom of God there will be no call for its exercise. But non-resistance in a world of sin can sometimes be practised only at the expense of love. For it might permit sin to bring suffering upon those who should be protected.

It goes without saying that through the centuries of human history some wars have been justifiable; in fact, in the evolution of society it may be that, as some insist, war has been a necessary and valuable factor in human progress. Certainly it has ministered to invention and artisanship in the matter of weapons. It has developed surgery and even architecture with its allied sciences. But, while this may be true, it is still quite another question whether war is in accordance with the principles of the gospel. But here again we must grant that the principle of non-resistance in national affairs can be pushed over into international affairs only when the nations involved recognize themselves as acting in accordance with Christian ideals. That war has sometimes been obviated because of such considerations is one of the glories of Christian history.

That in so many cases war has been allowed, and to a certain extent been sanctioned by the church, is one of the sadder facts of that same history.

And it is sadder because it is axiomatic that if one of the parties fights because it is injured then the other party to the war is probably a wrong-doer. It may be, of course, that both countries are partly in the wrong. It may be that each is, therefore, to some extent justified in protesting against some injury being done those who need protection. But, after all, such allowances are probably too generous. It is safer to say that, whatever may be the blessings which it has brought, war is to-day a tribute to the failure of civilization to embody the principles of Jesus.

Looked at from almost any angle, war is a hideous thing. And no men know this better than the great soldiers. Patriotism is noble, and willingness to sacrifice for one's nation is even nobler. But why should patriotism express itself only in fighting? And why should sacrifice for one's fatherland be not as noble when it comes to paying taxes as when it comes to offering one's life? Disguise it as much as we can, too many of the wars which have been fought for national honor have really been fought for the purpose of conquering lands. Such a motive is not Christian; it could not be Christian.

The problems of establishing universal international peace are admittedly difficult of solution.

There is the great question of disarmament, for example. Christian Europe maintains a vastly larger standing army than the Roman empire that once covered the lands with a population almost as great as that which fills the same territory to-day. The increase in armaments both military and naval is impoverishing nearly every nation in Europe. A single battleship will cost more money than is in possession of almost any college or university in the world, and yet be "out of date" within a few months after its construction. The cost of a navy, even in the United States, is sometimes one hundred and thirty-five million dollars for one year. And the nations move on with an ever-increasing budget of expense for the simple reason that each fears that its neighbor may be a more powerful fighter than itself.

Are then our Christian nations desirous of war? What they claim is that they are desirous of not having war; that the way to prevent war is to prepare to fight. And yet it would be quite as true to say that, back of all this military preparation, there will be found somewhere an ambition on the part of one or two great powers to get hold of territory on the continents of Africa or Asia for the purpose of colonization. Such motives in turn rest upon economic conditions of the various nations of Europe, and make the entire question of national disarmament increasingly difficult to answer. There are plenty of theories which would attempt

to solve the problem, but there is little prospect of any one of them being put into operation until the question of war ceases to be merely economic and becomes one of morality. Public opinion here, as in all other cases, will have small influence until it is tempered by a sense of moral obligation born of fraternity.

Now, it is this sense of moral obligation that the Christian seeks to impart. If the church cannot be content to be a mere ambulance corps of civilization, it must be ambitious to carry over into international politics those principles which are fundamental in its religion. For there cannot be perpetually two ideals, the one of politics and the other of morality. Some day one or the other will succumb. If, when that day comes, we are not to have a frank justification of force as the final court of appeal in human affairs, it will be because the principles of love and of fraternity have been so wrought into society that the great nations will not care to act contrary to them. But if such socialization of fraternity is ever to come, it must needs be through the transformation of actual human lives. National morality cannot be far in advance of individual morality. Unless we are ready to feel that revenge and the spirit of fighting are incompatible with the Christian spirit of forgiveness and love as far as individuals are concerned, it is not likely that we shall be ready to approve of principles of international peace. And that, perhaps, will be the real

test that every Christian will first put upon himself. Not, whether he believes in war, but whether he is ready to forgive other men their trespasses.



Quiz

1. Show that war is not in harmony with the teachings of Jesus. 2. Is absolute non-resistance justifiable? Why not? 3. Has war brought any benefits to the world? If so, name some. 4. Name some of the evils of war. 5. What would you say about the need for and cost of armies and navies? 6. What is generally the primary reason for war? 7. What is the basal argument against war? 8. How can Christian ideals help toward world peace?

Questions for Further Study

1. Mention some of the virtues that war develops. 2. Mention some of the evils that develop during the period of war. 3. Mention some war that seems to you to have been undertaken from Christian principles. 4. Could it have been avoided without a sacrifice of Christian principles? 5. Would international arbitration make war unnecessary? 6. How far do you think it advisable to practise the principle of non-resistance in your personal affairs? 7. What are some of the evils that come from quarreling? 8. Do the same results come from war?

CHAPTER IX

SOCIAL CLASSES

ANY discussion of the social gospel would be incomplete that overlooked the great movement now going on throughout the world toward the development of social classes. This development is, of course, not unparalleled in other periods, but never before has similar class consciousness developed in the same degree as at present. Has the gospel any message for such a situation?

In answering this question, it is well to bear in mind that the Christian church was founded at a time when classes were very sharply marked, although not quite in the same fashion as to-day. At the bottom of the social scale were the slaves. They were not of any particular race, but were drawn from practically all parts of the then known world. Debt or war or birth was constantly recruiting their numbers. Many of them were men of ability and character; but the great majority of them were lacking in any of those finer qualities which freedom develops. The gospel, however, won many even of these.

Among freemen there was no such equality as exists to-day in a first-class modern State. There were different classes in the eyes of the law, and

each class possessed a varying number of legal rights. A crime committed by members of one class would be less severely punished than in the case of the same crime committed by some member of another class. Apart from these legally recognized groups, moreover, there were those other classifications which have always existed in highly developed States. The pages of the New Testament are full of allusions to the "multitude" and the "rich," to the "rulers," the "Pharisees," and Jewish parties. In fact, no one can quite appreciate the life of Jesus who does not recall the fact that Palestine in his day was preparing for that social revolution which broke out in A. D. 66, and resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem. The classes and the masses were opposed to each other just as truly as now. The people, who were despised by the Pharisees, were looking for some man to come and lead them in a revolt against privilege and oppression. They looked to Jesus as a possible leader, only to have him refuse any such position. The early church found itself also exposed to the revolutionary temptation, especially as it gathered into itself members from all these various classes.

Yet, here we must notice that which at first glance seems surprising. Neither Jesus nor his apostles ever undertook the rôle of social agitator, or spoke against certain evils, *e. g.*, slavery. In fact, Paul at one time sent back Onesimus, a slave, to his master, Philemon; and in a number of in-

stances counseled the slave not to seek to be undutiful or untrue to his owner.

Any careful study of the New Testament will convince the student that the position taken by Paul relative to slavery was probably due to two causes: First, his belief that the heavenly kingdom would be shortly established by the return of Christ; and secondly, his belief that the gospel had to do, not with social position, but with the quality of the inner life. To one who believed in the new life, slavery and freedom were merely temporary conditions which could be overlooked. The real thing was the "new creation."

Nor was this all. Paul saw, as the letter to Philemon indicates, that although slavery was an existing institution of the empire, which he was not ready to attack, true Christians were brothers whatever might be their relative position in the eyes of the Roman law. In Christ there was neither bond nor free. So Onesimus, as a slave, returned to his master as "a brother beloved."

It is evident that if once this conception of fraternity gets into society, slavery cannot continue. A man may enslave a fellow-creature whom he has taken in war, but he cannot enslave his brother. And so it has come about that the spirit of Jesus has found one of its social expressions in the abolition of slavery itself.

It is this fact to which we must look in our search for general evangelical principles in the

present struggles between classes which have grown out of our economic life. The gospel, as such, recognizes no "classes," just as it recognizes no sex. It deals with human souls, and human souls weigh the same because they can become godlike. Now, out from this inevitably does there grow the attitude of love which makes the treatment of others, either individually or collectively, one phase of the fraternity offered by the gospel.

In our present situation it must certainly appear that the message of the gospel is that, since God is love, it is necessary for the members of one class to embody their Christian life in their class action. Otherwise they would not be like their heavenly Father. And this is true, wholly regardless of what theory as to society we may hold. If class consciousness is really contrary to the best ideals of humanity, then it must perish in the same proportion as the fraternal spirit of the gospel becomes socialized. If, on the other hand, the existence of some sort of class consciousness is inevitable in society, and is not inconsistent with the development of Christian social ideals, then the Christian spirit will so express itself that the members of the various classes with different economic interests will live in mutual comity. Strictly speaking, it is not the business of the gospel to settle such economic questions as are involved in class consciousness and the existence of social classes in a democracy; but it can hardly be denied that if Christians

were to follow out, with thorough consistency, the implications of the spiritual life experienced by them because of loyalty to Jesus, very many of the questions arising from the existence of social classes would disappear. That is one great message of the social gospel.

Without ignoring the fact that men do belong to different callings, or that they are, either justly or unjustly, possessed of differing privileges, the gospel would have its followers treat one another as brethren. This is not to say that the business of the church is to attempt such social reorganization as the Socialists demand. It is rather to say that in this world of ours, with its varied interests, institutions, and duties, the truly Christian spirit is one which ignores distinctions which spring from anything other than moral causes. It cannot ignore slavery to-day, because we now see that it is wrong. Nor can it ignore those fearful conditions which arise from the growth of slums. For the slums are not merely an economic, they are also a moral issue. And beyond this the Christian spirit can extend far. It can develop such friendships and such conceptions of the worth of man as will reduce the bitterness of class feeling. It can move men to surrender privilege and to grant rights which reduce the enmities of class consciousness; and, most of all, it can insist upon the worth of the human soul, no matter in what economic class it may be found. And, unless the history of the church mis-

leads, it can do all this without accepting or denouncing any particular theory of social reconstruction, such as socialism. The social gospel is not primarily concerned with economic, but with spiritual values. If one sees that his own life does not consist in the abundance of things which he possesses, he will be pretty apt to see that the same is true of others; and seeing this, he will be ready to find brothers among men who differ in employment, in culture, in wealth. And what is more, although he may not fully sympathize with either, he will be ready to recognize the truly idealistic and spiritual elements in the great movements like those of organized labor and socialism.

But it is well to look this matter in the face. The rise of class consciousness at the present time is due to a sense of injustice regarding the division of material good things and opportunity of various sorts. Whether or not this feeling of injustice is unjustifiable does not concern us now. It is enough to say that a sense of injustice is observable among the causes which have given rise to the situation. Now class consciousness is likely to develop and to grow more bitter in the same proportion as it appears that Christians are indifferent to this alleged injustice. At the present time, charity, be it never so generous, is not regarded by the great masses of people as justifying the existence of certain conditions which affect the division of the product of labor. If Christians champion such forces as fail

to put the principle of self-sacrifice and love of Jesus at work in the economic field, it will follow that the rank and file of people who believe themselves ill treated will turn from the church. We already see some of the elements of this problem in the attitude of many laboring men. There is real danger lest the church shall be identified with one social class and so lose its grip upon all the others. Should this circumstance arise, it will be due, not to the church's loyalty to the gospel of brotherhood, but to its disloyalty to it and Jesus Christ.



Quiz

1. Name the social distinctions that existed in the days of Jesus. 2. What conditions contributed to the increase of the slave class? 3. What difference of privilege was accorded to different classes? 4. Describe the social condition of the early church. 5. Give reasons why the apostles did not attack the social conditions of their times. 6. How can the Christian spirit prevail in the presence of social distinctions? 7. Why does Christianity condemn slavery to-day, when it was tolerated by Paul? 8. What is the right attitude for Christian men in the face of present social unrest?

Questions for Further Study

1. What do you mean by a social class? 2. Which would you think more desirable, class dis-

inction based on birth or on wealth? What distinction seems to you more desirable than either?

3. Is a man any better because he is poor? Is he any better because he is rich? 4. To what temptations are the poor especially liable? To what temptations are the rich? 5. Is the tendency in your town toward the separation of people into classes? 6. What dangers are there in the development of class consciousness in America? 7. How can the churches assist in preventing these dangers?

Part IV

Economic Life

CHAPTER X

WEALTH

It would indeed be strange if we should find Jesus silent regarding wealth. His interest in humanity and all that pertains to humanity must have forced him to a consideration of the subject. Altogether the largest proportion of human endeavor is devoted to economic affairs. Reduce the hours of labor however we may, the great object of life on the part of most men is to earn enough to enable them to keep living. There is too, the widespread ambition to get rich. It is probably true that this, as much as any other motive in life, lies beneath the social evolution of society. It is not true, as some insist, that the economic are the only motives operative in human history; but they are certainly so prominent and so powerful as to be of first importance.

Now, Jesus, in teaching and living the gospel, was never far from life. He saw the poor all about him, and saw the rich turning from him. He himself had been obliged to earn a living for himself and, if tradition is to be believed, for his mother and his brothers and sisters. He saw too, how hard it is for men who are seeking wealth to make the things of spiritual value supreme. And for that reason he

spoke about wealth perhaps more than about any other subject, unless it was the kingdom of God and the wickedness of religious hypocrisy. In order to understand his position, it is necessary, first of all, to get his point of view, for that will be that of the gospel itself.

Clearly enough his interest in wealth is not that of the political economist. The modern world would be slow to dispense with those patient men of science who study the economic aspects of human life. All over the world we find them collecting the material on which they may base their discussions of the laws governing the production, distribution, and use of wealth. But Jesus is not of this class. He has no interest in wealth, as such. His eye is always upon men who are seeking wealth. The problem which the political economist would settle in terms of laws, of wages, and of money, he would solve in terms of justice and love.

It is worth while emphasizing to ourselves the fact that Jesus' teaching in this regard was not intended simply for those men among whom he lived. It would be doing him great injustice to regard his words concerning selfish rich people and the use of property as constituting a sort of temporary code of morality, fit only for those men who had left all and followed him. It is true that some of his sayings were intended primarily and exclusively for his apostles; but it is also true that in his discussions of wealth he sets forth principles and

makes applications which are the farthest possible from that which was applicable only to the Twelve.

In his own case he found it necessary to abandon his trade, and he who had been the carpenter of Nazareth became the homeless prophet. It is true that he called certain of his apostles away from their occupation, telling them that he would make them "fishers of men." And it is also true that when they recalled to him the fact that they had left everything to follow him, he assured them of that reward which was awaiting all those who made loyalty to him supreme over the ordinary good things of life. But in these cases it is easy to see that we have that which is exceptional rather than usual. Jesus himself never taught, and Paul emphatically repudiated the idea, that all men, in order to be Christian, should leave the ordinary vocations. If any man did not work, he was not to eat, according to the apostle. And with the exception of those few men whom he chose for a specific purpose, we have no intimation that Jesus ever counseled abandonment of secular occupations. All of his references to the economic life, whether it were farming or trade, are respectful. He was no demagogue, assailing the fundamental demands of social life in the name of a Utopia that could exist only in heaven. There have always been teachers who have insisted that a man to be good must be a man without employment. But the uniqueness of Jesus consists in his economic sanity. Devoted as he was to spiritual goods, he

saw that such goods could be possessed only as they were made supreme over temporal goods like land and houses and money.

This is the gospel's essential message as to the attitude of the regenerate life toward wealth. It is not that of contempt, much less is it the attitude of complete devotion. It is rather one which, recognizing the perspective of goods, sees that a man can afford to give the whole world in exchange for his life.

If we try, in our modern world, to take the same attitude toward business and all matters of wealth, we must first of all realize that we are not Christians *and* business men. We are Christians who are in business or in some form of industry. That is to say, in a certain sense the problem which we face is in one way more difficult than that which James, John, and Peter faced when they left their fishing business and became the disciples of Jesus. The average man and woman cannot, and ought not, to imitate the apostles' example in this particular. They must, so to speak, not only follow Jesus, but keep on fishing at the same time. And this it is which makes Christian living so difficult for us all. It would be comparatively easy to make the teaching of Jesus work if there were no necessity of getting our living; it would sometimes, at least, be a great deal easier to get our living or to get rich, if we were not trying to be loyal to Jesus!

Thus we come back again to the fundamental

social principles of the gospel. Not by removing ourselves from human affairs, but by living in them in accordance with the great principles of love, fraternity, and faith in the God who, partly with our co-operation, will bring in a better social order. But in thus taking our position upon these fundamental principles, we are not for a moment to believe that we are concerned with generalities so glittering as to be of no significance. Jesus was constantly endeavoring to get men to make these very conceptions primary in their lives. To put them to work in our economic world would certainly be to bring about some remarkable changes. For the getting of wealth is a moral question. You cannot earn your living, you cannot attempt to save, you cannot make investments, you cannot be an employer, or you cannot be employed without entering into relations which must be judged from the moral, *i. e.*, the Christian point of view. It is a fatal mistake that some men are making who think that all human progress is due to materialistic forces. The message of the gospel is that personality is superior to materialistic forces. This applies just as much and just as truly to matters of wealth as to anything else. That which is needed in our world just at the present time is the habit of testing every action by its relationship to human well-being. That is to say, the Christian principle of love must become increasingly supreme in our economic world or else that world will grow more cruel, and human

beings will become even more than they are now simply the cogs of a great industrial system.

The divine origin of the gospel will be shown by its capacity to humanize the entire industrial world. It must begin, as always, within the circle of Christian men; and Christian men must treat all persons, whether employer or employed, according to the principles they see are supreme in the teachings and life of Jesus. We cannot expect that reform will begin among men who are indifferent to the principles which Jesus taught, and all true reform in our world of industry should expect to find support in the church of Christ. If by any misfortune this should not be true; if the men who declare themselves to be Christians deliberately refuse to regard the struggle for livelihood and wealth as subject to the laws of personality, rather than to those of merely material things, then the church will suffer and humanity will suffer and, what is more, God's will will not be done in earth as it is in heaven.

But what true Christian is apprehensive of any such outcome of the working of God's truth and God's Spirit among men?



Quiz

1. Why should we expect Jesus to speak of wealth? 2. To what social class did Jesus belong? 3. How widely do Jesus' words regarding self-denial apply? 4. Did Jesus' economic idea require poverty

as an essential to goodness? 5. With what motive may a Christian properly seek wealth? 6. Which is the more difficult to live, a Christian life in business, or in solitude? Why? 7. What is the highest test of our activities? 8. Who should lead in this higher conception of life?

Questions for Further Study

1. Is all wealth capital? 2. How does the situation of the wage-earner differ from that of his employer? 3. Is it wrong to try to be rich? 4. What do you understand is meant by the expression "The standard of living"? 5. Are the interests of labor and capital the same? (Do not be satisfied with a merely conventional answer. Think this matter through seriously and carefully.) 6. Do you think a man can be a thoroughly consistent Christian in his business? 7. In your opinion, would the world be better off if everybody had an income of, say, five thousand dollars a year? (The purpose of this question is to lead to a discussion of the desirability of having striking contrasts in our social world between the very poor and the very rich. In answering it, it will not do to trust first impressions. Imagine every one in your town to have the same income, and then see what the town would gain and what the town would lose. Also consider how long such a condition of affairs would continue, and what legislation would be necessary to make it continue.)

CHAPTER XI

THE RIGHTS OF THE POOR

"YE have the poor with you always; and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good" (Mark 14 : 7). Thus Jesus replied to the criticism passed by his disciples upon the woman who prodigally showed her love for the Master who had saved her from her sins. The words are something more than an aphorism of the social observer. They are even more than an appeal of a gentle idealist to men in danger of mistaking rigid adherence to the letter of their Master's word for action in accordance with his spirit. They are the embodiment of the attitude of the gospel to human need. The second clause is the Christian addition to a social fact. Without it the words of the first clause would sound almost heartless. But it will be observed that, in the entire treatment accorded by Jesus to the sad subject of poverty, he emphasizes not so much the rights of the poor as the duties of the rich. For this reason, if for no other, we are led to distinguish Jesus altogether from the social agitator. The emphasis of the latter is an insistence upon rights; the emphasis of Jesus is upon duty.

Yet we should be slow in saying that Jesus is indifferent to the rights of any person, in so far

as they are real rights. There can be no duties without rights; and in discussing the Christian attitude toward wealth, we cannot overlook the fact that Jesus' sympathy went out strongly to the poor.

There was reason for this. All about him Jesus saw the thousands of men and women to whom life meant only a struggle for existence. Poverty among the people of Palestine was no mere relative lack of wealth. All the information we have as to the economic condition of Jesus' fellow-countrymen goes to show that among them there was persistent and deadening and utter poverty. Palestine to-day is full of men so poor that even the poorer classes of America, if we except those in the worst of our slums, seem well to do. It was part of Jesus' call as the Christ to preach the gospel to these poor. To them he promised blessings that he never promised the rich. The hungry were to be filled; with the poor he himself was classed as one that had no place where he could lay his head; the beggar Lazarus, who had lacked all things in his earthly life, was taken to the bosom of Abraham. The early church, whether it was in Corinth, in Philippi, or in Jerusalem, was full of men and women whose very life was dependent upon charity. The first expression of organized Christian activity was the formation of a great charity fund by which the poor of the church at Jerusalem could be sustained. The striking thing with Jesus was, as has already been

pointed out, that salvation with him was not limited to the well-to-do and educated classes, but was extended to men without money and without culture.

It is easy for many to see in the words of Jesus and the practices of the early church a class movement that is hostile to wealth as such. But such an interpretation is not from the point of view of Jesus himself. Poverty in itself was not a good. Poor people were to inherit the kingdom of God, not because of their poverty, but because of their faith.

The Beatitudes, as we find them in Luke's Gospel, are not to be interpreted as a commendation of class consciousness. Spoken as they were to the disciples, they are to be interpreted as congratulations to men and women who, although poor, and hungry, and persecuted, were sure of the best things of the heavenly kingdom. That is to say, the rights of the poor, as Jesus sets them forth, are not primarily economic, but spiritual. They may share in all the blessings which he came to give; and he would be a most incorrect interpreter of Jesus, who saw in him a prevailing ambition to establish ideal economic conditions, or to promise as among his greatest blessings good dinners and large incomes. We may be sure Jesus died for a nobler ideal than that.

The correct interpretation of Jesus' teaching, however, is more favorable to the poor than any economic philosophy we may find within his words;

for he treats them as possessed of the same worth as those wealthy and comfortable and learned persons who despised them. You will search his words in vain for anything that can be wrested into technical economic teaching. Once, when he was appealed to by one of two brothers in the interest of getting what might very likely have been his just share of an inheritance, Jesus indignantly replied, "Who made me a judge or a divider among you? Do you beware of covetousness!" His constant exhortation to the rich to give to the poor, and to lend to those who would borrow, is not to be interpreted into a formulation of absolute rights which the poor man could plead over against the rich man. Fraternity is more than justice. But just because it is more than justice, the poor man has a right to expect from the Christian something more than a just accounting. For the very reason that Jesus recognizes in the poor man the worth of the human soul as of the utmost value, every humble life has a right to expect from Christians treatment as helpful and as considerate as that of which Jesus himself gave an example. The great difficulties which beset our economic life would certainly be diminished, if Christian men should recognize that all men have a right to expect from them the extension of the principles of fraternity to their business relations. Is it not too often the case that Christian men, in their dealings with each other in business affairs, are apt to think that it is impossible to carry the

teaching of Jesus into the factory and the counting-house and all the other places where men gather together to make a living?

The causes of poverty are many, and there is no single remedy. The very structure of our social life and its innumerable forces makes for selfishness and cruelty; thriftlessness; vices of all sorts, but particularly drunkenness; physical deterioration lasting through generations; the introduction of labor-displacing machinery; the death of wage-earners; disease; congested populations; business depression; all these are among the causes of poverty. And then poverty itself breeds poverty and vice and dependence. No cure has yet been found for it. It is the one great problem of society. But it must be answered. For no society can exist indefinitely in which poverty is unchecked.

Unless the records of the past utterly mislead us, and, for that matter, unless the knowledge of our own days is equally deceptive, the poor man has a grievance against society. But this is not to say that, if justice were done, there would be no poverty, for poverty often comes from personal sin quite as truly as from environment. After all allowances are made for the depressing and deteriorating conditions which industries conducted in unchristian fashion may have established, there still remains the great mass of poverty for which the poor man himself is responsible. It is often mere demagogism that leads a man to insist that, if the church were

what it should be, and if Christians were what they should be, poverty would be utterly abolished. It is hard to see how this could be true any more than it would be true to say that sin would be utterly abolished if the church was really doing its duty.

Yet, even after we have made such allowances as these, the gospel, with its message of fraternity, would prompt the Christian man to more consideration of others in monetary affairs and a larger readiness to help those who are unfortunate. It would be impossible to formulate just what rights there are which would follow from such a recognition; but can it be doubted that a Christian conception of society would lead one to believe that opportunity should be given for men to earn their livelihood; that provision should, in some way, be made possible for loss of employment through misfortune, and that there should be provision also for the honorable support of men and women who have passed the period when they can earn their living?

From the point of view of law, and indeed, from the nature of society, as it is now organized, it is impossible for the poor man to claim such things as legal rights. But whatever particular programme of reform may be adopted, the Christian spirit recognizes the right to Christian service and of help as universal in a world for which Jesus died. Such an obligation is more than legality.

And the gospel, as Jesus sets it forth, would

recognize that the working man who is not poverty-stricken but has an insufficient income, the man who does not own the machinery with which he toils, and lives by wages, has other than merely economic rights. To a considerable extent this has been realized by the State. Education, for instance, is every year growing more general and inexpensive. But he has other rights which the spirit of fraternity would recognize—such as the right to leisure, that he may not become a mere machine; the right to rational amusement, if need be, protected by the State from temptations to any form of injurious excess; the right to proper surroundings in the way of homes and well-protected machinery; the right to good hospitals and care when ill; the right to properly guarded institutions, in which he may save his little surplus and so develop a thrifty independence. It is true that it often happens that in the attempt to recognize some of these rights, rich men and employers have been disappointed in the lack of appreciation which their efforts seem to have called forth. But, after all, from the Christian point of view, appreciation on the part of one benefited is not of the greatest consequence. The one call of Jesus is not to do those things for which others will praise us; to give dinners to those who may give dinners in return; to salute those who will salute us in return; but rather to extend the spirit of the gospel into every economic relation. Difficult as it is, constantly exposed to misinterpreta-

tion and even to ridicule, as altruistic effort may be, the spirit of fraternity recognizes rights that law, as yet, has not created. That is one of the glories of the gospel. It dares call Christians to sacrifice for others' rights—for rights which those others have no power to enforce. In this, the Christian is to be like his God, who sends the rain and the sun, without which human life would be impossible, upon the evil and the good, the just and the unjust.



Quiz

1. Why did Jesus say "The poor ye have always with you"? 2. How does Jesus differ from a social agitator in his treatment of the rights of the poor? 3. Why did Jesus always show sympathy for the poor? 4. What justification is there for the idea that Jesus was hostile to the rich? 5. Was Jesus antagonistic to the rich? 6. According to Jesus, what is the character of the primary rights of the poor? 7. What are some of the causes of poverty? 8. What is the strongest basis of the claim of the poor upon the more wealthy? 9. What are some of the rights fraternity would recognize as possessed by wage-earners?

Questions for Further Study

1. What is the difference between a right and a duty? 2. Are there any rights that everybody can claim? 3. Do you think it is a good plan to give

something to every beggar? Justify your answer. 4. Explain the working of some charitable organization with which you are connected. 5. What effort is your town making to improve the conditions of the poor? 6. What is the really Christian way of treating poverty? 7. What help can the poor man expect in your town if he is ill? 8. How can working men be taught thrift? 9. Do you believe States should establish a pension for old or incapacitated working men?

CHAPTER XII

THE DUTIES OF THE RICH

IN passing from the discussion of the gospel's conception of rights to its teaching as to duties, we move into its own particular field. For the spirit of fraternity often prompts us to do things in love which we could not recognize as constituting a claim upon us on the part of the others. It is at this point that the real emphasis of the gospel is laid. For if the social gospel is the social implication of that life which Jesus lived and to which he shows the way, then we are face to face with spiritual impulses rather than legislation.

Jesus saw dangers which lie in wealth. Rich men he saw refusing him and clinging close to that sense of superiority which the gospel would have men lose in their sense of fraternity. True, he had friends among the wealthy. He made his grave with the rich. But, none the less, he saw that men could not serve God and mammon. They could love and serve either the one or the other. The difficulty he set forth sharply in the famous words about it being easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. Indeed, there are not a few of his sayings

which, if taken apart from everything else that he said, would lead one to feel that he was opposed to wealth itself; and the same can be said of the writers of many of the books of the New Testament.

But it was the danger threatening those who made riches primary in their lives that Jesus saw. Those who trusted in riches—not those who were merely rich—would find it difficult to enter the kingdom. The difference is significant because it is involved in the gospel itself. The things which a man has cannot save him, and cannot be saved by him. Only that which he is, his life, his soul, can share in the blessings which Jesus would give.

The dangers which lie in wealth have been so fully and freely described, and in most cases are so obvious, that it seems hardly necessary to discuss them here. Pride, licentiousness, greed, heartlessness, and the economic and moral waste of luxury are all special temptations to the man who, to any degree, fulfils his ambition to grow rich. The very power that wealth gives seems to make yielding to such temptations easy and even to justify men in so yielding.

But let us make no mistake here. A man does not need to be a multimillionaire before he heeds the warnings of Jesus. Wealth is a relative term, and a man does not need to be rich in order to try to be rich. Any one who thinks that there is some particular sum beyond which lies danger is sadly

mistaken. Who is meaner than some men who have only a few hundred dollars? The dangers against which Jesus warns are not to be expressed in terms of certain fortunes. They lie rather in the attitude of mind that would make material goods supreme. For the rich own the very machines and factories and railroads which the poor man must use if he is to earn his living. And such ownership is liable to lead to pride and an unfraternal sense of irresponsible power.

To offset the dangers of wealth, Jesus set forth certain duties of its possessors. Some of these duties were particularly those of the men among whom he lived. In his day charity was perhaps the only form of helping open to a rich man. But our modern world is far more complicated than the Jewish world, and the problems which wealth sets are to-day so complex that the mere giving of wealth away seems at the best to be only a partial solution of the problem of its Christian use. For it cannot be disguised that the division of men into those who own machines and those who use machines—using that word in a very wide sense—is one of the most critical situations in our modern life.

There are, for example, the entire question as to the method in which wealth is to be acquired—the questions of wages, the housing of the working men, the hours of labor, the right to influence other lives through the ownership of the instruments of pro-

duction. All these are in a different field from that of charity. And yet they are not outside the social gospel as Jesus would set it forth. For to them the principle of love and fraternity and divine co-operation must certainly apply.

He would be an unwise counselor who at this point would suggest as the teaching of Jesus any particular economic programme. The main concern of the gospel is not with questions of wages and capital, of hours of labor, or even of poverty itself. It is rather with developing a responsiveness to human need, a sense of fraternity which will shape up cautiously and yet surely such courses of action as will best express the Christian spirit in the world of labor.

We should expect this gospel would get the first and most consistent exemplification among Christian men. The very quality of life which is theirs because they are the children of God, should prompt them to any sacrifices which love, exemplified in Jesus, would approve. It may not be possible to say just how Jesus, if he lived to-day, would conduct a great store or a newspaper, or any form of business where men are employed by the owner of capital; but it is perfectly clear that any method he adopted would be seen to be consistent with the great principle which he exemplified even to the cross.

The duties of the rich (*i. e.*, those of the capitalist class) from the point of view of the social gospel,

therefore, are primarily moral. That is what makes them so far-reaching; for there is no aspect of the economic life that is not moral. The ideals which are to prevail in all our busy life, and particularly in every form of industry, are moral ideals. Every Christian, whether he is working man or capitalist, must see to it that he exemplifies these ideals in his own conduct. It is not at all difficult for most of us to decide whether a course of action is prompted by love or by a desire to succeed at all costs. We all know how to be more honest than we are. In the same spirit it can be said: Christians know how to be more fraternal than they are. Every advance which they make toward such larger expression of the spirit of Christ in economic affairs, will be accompanied by a wider extension of industrial justice.

There is one parable of Jesus which sets this matter forth clearly. It is that of the Unjust Steward (Luke 16 : 1-13). Jesus does not commend this bad man for his dishonesty; but he does point out that in his plot against the owner of the estate we should discover the power of wealth to make friends. And he urges his followers to be as wise in their generation as are the children of this age in theirs. That is to say, he would teach them that wealth should be so used as to insure the maintenance of friendship, and friendships are only another form of fraternity.

Thus it appears that here, as throughout the

entire region of human relations to which the gospel applies, we look to Jesus, not for explicit commands, but for the revelation and the embodiment of central principles which are of universal application. His severe words against the wealthy are not those of the man who hates wealth, but of the man who sees that it, like any source of power, tends to break down one's sense of dependence upon others, and above all tends to make a man selfish and sometimes heartless. To be possessed of wealth is a great trust. Used wisely and according to the spirit of Jesus it may be a source of wonderful help. But to make the search for, or the possession of wealth supreme, whether it be on the side of the poor man or of the rich man, is to do violence to the Christian spirit.

In a word, the duty of the rich man is to acquire wealth honestly and without injury to others, and to use it as the agent of fraternity, the servant of love, one of the instruments by which God may bring about that better social order for which we pray. And if this should mean that some of the methods by which wealth has been gathered are to be abandoned, or that wealth is to be given away; if it should mean the establishment of new relationships between employer and employed, or some sacrifice for the sake of more clearly and effectively recognizing the worth of human well-being; none of these would be regarded by Jesus as reaching the limit of sacrifice the Christian spirit would

justify. He himself sacrificed more. He gave up his life for his enemies.

We can hardly conclude this study without recalling that it is precisely at this point that one of the great tests of Christianity is being made in our day. It is probably true that the great mass of wealth in Christian countries is in the hands of professing Christians. In a sense far truer than most of us realize, this ownership of property is being used as an argument against the gospel. It is asserted, sometimes most unthoughtfully, that if these Christian men and women were really loyal to the spirit of Christ, they would give up their wealth, or at least would seek to make radical changes in the conduct of such businesses as give them their income. Now it must be admitted that grounds are not lacking for criticism of some wealthy Christians. It is not merely that they are apparently unscrupulous in their business affairs; some of them seem to be indifferent to the relationship of their professions of loyalty to Christ with their business affairs. To this indifference must be charged in part the growth of that discontent which we find throughout the world, and which has given rise in large measure to the "war between the classes." And it is the same indifference that causes apprehension for the future.

But the situation is by no means hopeless. There is a growing sense of responsibility for wealth on the part of Christian people, and unless all signs

fail, the present increasing interest in the social significance of the teaching of Jesus, and of the social implications of the Christian life, will serve still further to rectify such abuses as undoubtedly do exist.

In the meantime it is the duty of Christian men and women to favor all such wise reforms as look to the extension of the spirit of fraternity throughout the economic world. It should never be said that Christian people are indifferent to those ethical movements which are now sweeping over the world of industry. There must be the spirit of reconciliation in the world of capital and labor as truly as between individuals, and to whom shall the world look for effecting that reconciliation more properly than to those whose life has been touched by the Spirit of God and who are endeavoring to live a life like that of Jesus?



Quiz

1. What rich friends did Jesus have? 2. Why did Jesus make great demands upon the rich for sacrifice? 3. What are some of the dangers of wealth? 4. What is the main concern of the gospel in respect to the rich? 5. What is the character of the primary duties of the rich? 6. What did Jesus teach is the purpose of wealth? 7. When is a man rich? 8. What is the true Christian attitude toward reforms now pending between rich and poor?

Questions for Further Study

1. What are some of the dangers that threaten rich people? 2. Who will probably save more money, a man on a small or large salary? Why? 3. If you had a million dollars to give away, how would you go about it wisely? 4. Does the rich man need a sort of gospel different from the poor man's? 5. Can a man be a kind father and an unkind employer? 6. What are some of the ways in which the principles of the gospel could be more completely put into operation in the factory? 7. Do you think business is growing more, or less, Christian?

CHAPTER XIII

THE CHURCH AND LABOR

THE problem of labor is not a problem of poverty. Laboring men may be poor, but labor is productive; poverty is non-productive. The great problem of labor concerns its share in the new values which production gives raw material—that is to say, such problems as those of wages, the number of hours that shall constitute a working day, and the right of organized labor to bargain collectively with organized capital. Far more than most of us realize, the labor problem, in its present form, is new. There have always been men who have ill used their workmen; there have always been workmen who have tried for higher wages. Ancient history abounds in reference to these various struggles of this sort. But the problem of labor to-day is different in its becoming increasingly a struggle between two great interests and classes of society. Capital began to organize in the middle of the eighteenth century, when the first great factories were established, but it is only within comparatively recent years that the working men have begun to organize in any really efficient manner. Their right to organize is, theoretically, disputed by few. The real ground of struggle between capital and labor

centers about the right of organized labor not only to insist upon certain wages and the length of the working day, but also to prevent the employment of non-union labor, either in place of it or alongside of it, as in the "open shop."

It is not possible for us to enter into any elaborate discussion of the labor problem. We are concerned with another aspect of the labor movement, and that is its relation to the church and the share that the church may have in bringing about more amicable and just relations between the two elements of organized industry. And this is the more needed because of the suspicion of the church held, and even fostered, by certain elements in the ranks of organized labor. To them the church is only an agency of capitalism. Most of us know such a charge is false of the churches as a class, but the misconception is all too widespread and influential.

But let us insist on one thing strongly: the business of the church of Jesus Christ is not that of an economic reform association. Its primary interest is not in wealth, but in souls. Wherever it faces that mission with intelligence, prayer, and a large social outlook, it renders most important service in the industrial world. It will favor neither workmen nor employer as such. It has a more noble office.

In the first place, it will inject into the world of industry the gospel's estimate of the worth of personality. Ultimately, the relations between organized capital and organized labor, though de-

creasingly individual, must be personal; that is to say, laboring men are persons, and those who employ them are persons, even though a legal and an impersonal entity, the corporation, seems to be the representative of capital. For, strictly speaking, capital does not employ men. Men employ men. No matter how vast may be the capitalization of a corporation, its capital is administered by human beings. And human beings must treat other human beings as persons capable of happiness, suffering, and moral progress.

In the second place, the church can transform the industrial struggle by socializing its own conception of fraternity.

The constant danger is that men shall overlook duties in their struggle for rights. The relations of the two parties in the industrial struggle are constantly threatening to become more impersonal, and thus cause both labor and capital alike to come to disregard the fraternal element in all industrial struggles. It is at this point that the gospel can be made helpful; for it is constantly insisting that human relations can be governed since they are human. That is the very foundation assumption of Jesus' teaching as to Christian love.

It is confessedly difficult to know just what particular form this personal relationship will assume. We do not yet sufficiently understand all the factors that enter into the problem of modern industrial life to make a final solution advisable; but we can at

least see the truth of the teaching of Jesus relative to the comparative worth of men and wealth. And we can also see that the claims of justice, and more than that, the claims of love, will not be realized until our industrial world is organized on the basis of the supremacy of the human element in life. Capital has its rights just as certainly as labor, and the Golden Rule is as much a formulation of the laboring man's obligations as those of his employer. There is every opportunity here for that patience and regard for each other's rights which lie at the basis of all co-operation. The moral note must be struck before the economic problem can be answered properly, and, unless all signs fail, men are beginning to realize that nothing is settled until it is settled aright. The Christian can go even further. With the courage and the sensitized conscience born of a belief in the truth of the gospel, he can say that nothing is settled until it is settled on the principle of fraternity.

The gospel has no specific teaching in this field. The problem of organized labor had not arisen above the horizon in the days of Jesus, and so we have had preserved from him no such specific directions regarding it as we have in the case of marriage. But our social experience enables us to see the implications involved in his general principle. Among these we should mention the practice of kindness in all our dealings between representatives of labor and capital; the recognition of the principles of arbi-

tration in so far as arbitration does not involve the fundamental positions of the two parties; the election of men of moral character and vision as the leaders of organized labor, and, in so far as Christian men are members of labor unions, their duty to emphasize the worth of Christian principles. It is true that such considerations do not form a programme for the settlement of the labor problem, but they will do something quite as important—they will introduce into our industrial world those moral impulses and develop those attitudes toward various problems which will make programmes possible. The recognition of the principle of fraternity will prevent either party from denying the rights of the other; it should also bring about a spirit of forbearance and patience which will make discussion between the two parties more probably result in just decisions.

In the third place, it is possible, from the Christian point of view, to see more specific duties, at least where the personal well-being of the laboring man is concerned. The settlement of the length of the day's toil; the equipment of factories and other places of employment with proper sanitary and other conveniences; the limitation, within reasonable bounds, of the employment of women and children—there can be small question as to the evangelical position in such matters. And it is one of the happiest signs of the times that many corporations, sometimes with an avowed willingness on the part of their directors to embody in their business the Golden Rule, are

undertaking what is known as "welfare work" among their employees. They are establishing club-houses and pension funds for the sick and aged, and insurance for those who are injured. They are increasingly using safety devices where there is special danger of injury, and are employing capable women as counselors and guides for their female workers. Thoughtful observers of the trend of affairs are hopeful that such methods will become widespread, and that in the same proportion as our new industries become better organized, these and similar institutions will become recognized as indispensable parts of industry. Christian people can greatly assist in the development of such helpful agencies by insisting on the worth of men as men, and upon the education of the young in evangelic, that is, fraternal ethics. It can hardly be said to be advisable for clergymen, as a rule—there will always be exceptions—to enter into labor disputes; but it is indispensable that they should wisely set forth the social implications of the Christian life as they are applicable to the labor problem. Without being partisans, they should grow sympathetic with the claims of labor and, if possible, helpful to rightful labor leaders. Farthest possible should the church be from becoming the possession of only the capitalistic elements in society.

Furthermore, steps should be taken to bring organized and unorganized labor into closer fellowship with Protestant churches. All parties

would be benefited by such a reconciliation. Misunderstandings on both sides are now too common, particularly in the case of many members of the labor unions who fail to see the real purposes and feel the real sympathies of Christians. The churches and above all, the ministers and officers, need to appreciate the fact that the labor movement is a cause, not merely an economic uprising. Let us, as Christians, practise here the Golden Rule, and without overlooking the faults and mistakes of organized labor, recognize the idealism and self-sacrifice that make its increasingly intelligent struggle for a fuller life as well as shorter working days and higher wages for wage-earners.

Nor is this quite the last word. The gospel does not come to us as a mere code of duties. It is the message of the final of love. We need a larger confidence in its truth. The man who grows pessimistic because of the heartlessness and violence in the industrial world, the demagogism of so many labor leaders, and the stubborn holding of so many men to privilege, is really distrusting the promise of Jesus that it is the Father's good pleasure to give his true children the kingdom. He needs to hear again Jesus' rebuke to those of little faith.



Quiz

1. How does the labor problem of to-day differ from that recorded in ancient history? 2. What is

the real ground of struggle between capital and labor? 3. What suspicion of the church is held by certain elements in the labor classes? 4. What must be the relations between organized capital and organized labor? 5. Why have we no specific directions from Jesus regarding the labor problem? 6. What principle will prevent either party from denying the rights of the other? 7. What are some of the steps that are being taken by some corporations for the benefit of their employees? 8. How can Christian people assist in the development of such helpful agencies?

Questions for Further Study

1. What do you mean by the labor problem? 2. Do you think your church wants working men to join it? Have you any facts to base your opinion upon? 3. Why do so many leaders of organized labor ignore the Protestant churches? 4. What are some of the methods now being adopted to bring the church and organized labor together? 5. What should be the policy of a minister in case of a strike in his town? 6. What do you think should be the attitude of a church in the case of an agitation in favor of shorter working hours for women?

Part V

Social Regeneration

CHAPTER XIV

THE SOCIAL FORCES IN THE GOSPEL

FROM the earliest times there have always been those who have sought to improve the social life in the midst of which they live. They have not always developed a complete social philosophy; in fact, such philosophies have been rare. But most of the great leaders in human history have attempted to make social advance along some theory as to what progress should involve.

The Mosaic legislation, for instance, in so far as it regards human relations, marks a remarkable advance over conditions that existed prior to its formulation. It is true that, as Jesus said of the laws of Moses regarding divorce, it was not perfect, but accommodated to the times for which it was prepared. But it was pointed toward the ideals to be fully given by Jesus. Mosaicism did not, for example, abolish slavery, but it did improve the position of the slave. It did not abolish divorce, but it made divorce more difficult. Further, it planned for certain times of social readjustment, such as the year of Jubilee, and in the case of land tenure, it sought to prevent the development of a landed aristocracy which might curtail the rights of the poor man. But, best of all, it developed great moral

principles which, as formulated in the Ten Commandments, are calculated not only to make property rights more secure, but also to prevent men from developing a wrong attitude toward their neighbors. In fact, as Jesus said in the great commandment, the very heart of Mosaicism, is to love God and one's neighbor. And, however imperfectly the Jews realized that command, it has never been surpassed as the quintessence of religion and morality.

The writings of the prophets, also, are filled with social teaching. There is no one of the prophets whose words have been preserved for us, who did not rebuke severely the abuses of his time, as regards the State, the family, and wealth. One of the glories of prophecy was that it concerned itself so immediately with social dangers and obligations.

Interesting also is the teaching of the Pharisees and of the rabbis of Jerusalem concerning social rights and duties. There is, indeed, almost no field of social life that the Talmud, in which these teachings are preserved, does not touch and attempt to organize in accordance with the law of Jehovah. That must always be the glory of Judaism that it saw the religious significance of human life, and sought to make men regardful of the will of God in their dealings with their fellows.

In Greek life also we find various theories of social reorganization. Most important of these is the great treatise of Plato, "The Republic." In it

he endeavors to build up an ideal of a State that should be controlled by philosophers; that is to say, by men not only who could see the real meaning of human life, but could organize human relations in accordance with the noblest principles. The ideal State of Plato, however, was clearly unworkable, and his social teachings are rather of the nature of interesting speculation than of practical application. There are involved in them certain conceptions of the family which are far enough from those both of Moses and of Christ, and according to him society would have been so broken into classes as to lack any semblance of that quality that the Christian would recognize in Jesus' teaching as to love and fraternity.

The Middle Ages saw various attempts at social idealism, but they were, in most cases also, far removed from the ideals of the gospel, and few of them, and they unsuccessfully, moved out into the region of real democracy.

With the eighteenth century, however, we find both Europe and America agitated with the social philosophy that was to have large results in the actual organization of the State. The idea of the natural rights of man, which the French Revolution attempted to enforce in an unwise and too often cruel fashion, was embodied more successfully in the American Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. This philosophy of natural rights still shows its results in our modern

thinking, although the terms are not always the same as those of the eighteenth-century philosophy.

Far more important, however, for the modern world are the various theories which go under the name of socialism. The essential thought of all these theories is that capital should be owned, not by individuals, but by society. Thus all economic injustice, it is claimed, would be obviated, since nobody could grow rich, and the capitalist class would disappear, and with it, poverty. Various schools have various theories as to how this fundamental programme can be met, but all agree in attacking vigorously the present system of private ownership of capital. Socialism does not mean the division of wealth among different individuals, but rather the precise opposite, the consolidation of capital in the hands of the community and the equitable division of the product among all members of society. Roughly speaking, socialism would have all productive agents, such as land, factories, railroads, telegraphs, stores, fisheries, mines, etc., conducted in something the same fashion as public schools and the post-office are already conducted. The great power of socialism, however, in its various forms, does not lie in any particular programme for reconstruction. Few Socialists can agree here, and their leaders seem to be more concerned in attacking existing organizations than in creating a new order. Socialism, as a general influence in society, however, must not be underestimated. There are

already millions of Socialists, and even in America their number is increasing.

Socialism, however, is often thought of as something more than a theory as to how capital should be owned. To some of its followers it is a rival of religion, and is concerned with every aspect of our social life. As presented by some of its champions, it becomes a bitter opponent of Christian ideals. But it is unjust to make the term socialism cover every belief held by Socialists. Officially speaking, in America it is at present limited to economic matters.

The secret of its power, undoubtedly, lies in that it is a class movement, and tends to give expression to the discontent and the sense of injustice which is felt by many working men, and by some who are not wage-earners. There are a number of men calling themselves Christian Socialists who hold that under socialism alone it is possible for the principles of Christianity really to become operative. But most of us are by no means convinced that this is necessarily true.

The fundamental difference between the gospel and all these various theories of social regeneration is obvious. The gospel is neither individualistic nor socialistic; that is to say, it is not fundamentally an economic message. It is a message that deals primarily with human life and that seeks to transform human lives into conformity with the ideals of Jesus by bringing them into regenerating relations with God. It leaves all its followers free to choose what-

ever particular social theory seems to them best calculated to make its principles operative.

But one thing is never to be forgotten in all discussions like ours. Christianity ceases to be Christian the moment it ceases to have faith in God as a loving Father, and replaces personal with impersonal motives. We must give Christ to the world. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to all those who believe in Jesus. It should not be complicated with questions of capital or labor. It must express itself, as we have seen, in all forms of social life, but it is not to be identified with any social theory. In the same proportion as it makes men brothers, will new and better social theories emerge; but the emphasis of the church must be upon the new life in Christ. If the ideals of Christ are to be wrought into humanity, we may well expect that conditions will everywhere improve. But that is not to say that the kingdom of God will be built on any economic theory. We may well trust the regenerate life when once it is wisely directed by a knowledge of circumstances to adopt the wisest policy for our age.

But we must not overlook that the gospel really does introduce into society constructive forces, and these forces are primarily those which lie back of all endeavor. The Christian, says Jesus, is to be the "salt of the earth." That is, he is to supply the preservative element in our social life. And this element which Christianity supplies to the world in the

midst of which it lives is personal. It arouses in human lives motives which otherwise would be lacking. Therein it is superior to every other religion.

These motives are easily recognized. Paul summarized them under three great words, "faith, hope, and love." No society can develop far without these three. If it does not have within it men who are full of faith in God, it will grow materialistic and sensual. If it lacks citizens who can see the kingdom and hope for it as well as believe in God's power to produce it, it will grow unambitious and stop, like Mohammedan or Chinese civilization, at a certain grade of development. Most of all, if the spirit of love is not introduced within it, it will grow brutal in its worship of power, and the poor and the weak will be without any recourse, except that of revolution.

These three personal motives the gospel brings to the world. Our sociologists have not as yet appreciated what this really means. They have told us that religion has had a great part in social evolution, but they seem to overlook the fact that the gospel revealed by Jesus has released forces which are far above superstition and capable of transforming men and, through them, of transforming society. Once let men and women have faith in God, genuine hope of a kingdom of God, and Christlike love for their fellows, and any society that ever existed will be transformed for the better. For God can, and will, work with and through them.

Quiz

1. What was the effect of Mosaic legislation on slavery? 2. What was the attitude of the prophets regarding socialism? 3. Why was the ideal State of Plato unworkable? 4. What is the essential thought of socialism? 5. What is the secret of the power of socialism? 6. What is the difference between the gospel and the various theories of social regeneration? 7. Why is Christianity superior to every other religion? 8. What three elements are necessary to society?

Questions for Further Study

1. What is the difference between socialism and sociology? 2. What is the difference between socialism as a theory touching economic life and socialism as a general theory for society? 3. Which is the stronger motive in life, the desire to make money or the desire to do good? 4. Do you think that if Jesus were alive to-day he would be a Socialist?

CHAPTER XV

PUNISHMENT

IT is one of the unfortunate misinterpretations to which the gospel has been subjected, that men have sometimes thought that because God was love, punishment is no part of the divine plan for the world. But a serious study of the teaching of Jesus will make it plain that just because God is love, that which is opposed to love must be opposed to God, and cannot fail to bring suffering. Sin is something more than a failure to do that which one ought to do. It is a positive force in society, always acting contrary to the spirit of fraternity and the will of God.

In the same proportion as society becomes dominated by the spirit of love, must it inevitably oppose and repress those evil forces which are within it, and are injurious to its members and to itself. Without such opposition and repression—that is to say, without the exercise of a rational severity toward whoever is openly opposed to love, society would be constantly in danger of making its own ideals self-destructive. The punishment of crime, if only it be administered in the proper spirit, is consistent with fraternity as a basic social principle.

We must, however, distinguish sharply between

revenge and punishment. Any form of the former is evil, and will certainly lead, not to social regeneration, but to social degeneration. Lawlessness always breeds lawlessness. Irrational punishments breed a new brood of reckless sins. No community ever permits an evil to persist without itself suffering therefor. Recall, for instance, the effect of saloons upon a town, and of vicious amusements upon the young. Human nature is so constituted that it can never give way to any form of selfishness without losing something of its best self. Jesus was most wise in his warning against anger and the search for revenge on the part of individuals; but his principle is of equal value in the case of communities. Revenge may be sweet, but so is many a poison.

Unlike acts of revenge, punishments which are formulated wisely and are properly adapted to the crimes, may have educational results. They may not only serve to bring suffering to the man who has done wrong and so tend to prevent others from doing wrong, but they may even be remedial in themselves. Certainly the latter purpose is involved in our Christian criminal legislation. We should not put criminals into jail to get revenge, but to make crime appear dangerous and to make criminals into good citizens.

It is precisely at this point that our entire system of criminal procedure needs reformation. In the nature of the case, many of the agents whom society must employ in its pursuit and punishment of

crime, are not of high moral character. The persons who actually come in contact with prisoners—such as policemen, keepers, and guards in prisons—are not always under the control of even approximately Christian ideals. In many cases a term in prison serves to confirm criminal tendencies on the part of those suffering punishment, and thus the punishment, so far from being remedial, is really conducive to crime. Such results are neither Christian nor even good policy.

Further, also, our police methods (especially the so-called “sweat-boxes” and “the third degree”) are wholly unjustified by law and, as usually exercised, are unworthy of a society that makes any claim to being Christian. The science of criminology, however, is developing, and there is an increasing desire on the part of students of society to rectify these evils. The “parole system” has been adopted in certain States and cities, and in many, if not all cases, has given gratifying results. It is becoming a custom also to separate young criminals from those who are hardened in crime, and to teach them trades which will enable them to become self-supporting members of society. Altogether, it seems as if the new criminology was being increasingly brought under the influence of the gospel, a fact which could hardly be otherwise when we recall how many unselfish men and women are engaged now in the attempt to discover the best way not only to punish criminals, but to prevent adults and children

who have once started on the downward path from becoming actual criminals.

It is also to be emphasized that the extension of Christian principles into the sphere of punishment would lead to a provision for discharged criminals. It is hardly to be expected that a man who has been known to have been in prison for some crime should escape suspicion upon his release; and it is even more natural to suspect the discharged convict who is a woman; but no form of Christian helpfulness is more demanded than the establishment of agencies by which former prisoners can be given employment and allowed to find their way back into society as citizens. But, important as this is, it has been sadly neglected by Christian people. True, there are a number of members of society engaged in the work, but the entire method by which a prisoner is reinstated in society at the present time, puts a premium on his relapse into criminal companionship. When the spirit of fraternity is more operative, this defect will be removed and a better method of conducting prisons and reformatories will be supplemented by better methods of reestablishment of criminals as responsible citizens.

There are many questions which are being discussed in this connection, particularly in regard to the habitual criminal, the children of criminals, and delinquent boys and girls. But they are too technical for discussion here. We should notice, however, that in many States there are now being established

juvenile courts, where children, not yet criminals, are being tried and a system of probation is being established which maintains some oversight over delinquent children in the place of having them committed to prison. Nothing could be more important than this, for "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of imprisonment."

But, after all, punishment is really not a part of the gospel message. The ideal of the Christian church is something more than that of the State. While it is unquestionable that Jesus has no social teaching for bad men, he has a message for them—a call to repentance and a promise of forgiveness. The church should carry this message to our jails and prisons and reformatories as earnestly as to sinning men and women whom the law has not punished. Its ministration in such sad places should be evangelistic, reenforced and supplemented by help to all those who claim to have really repented. And the spirit which the gospel would engender in Christians should be one of great patience. Far more than most of us realize, the inmates of our jails are victims of circumstances and of disease, as well as men and women who have deliberately undertaken to do wrong. A criminal is very apt to be in some way a degenerate. If Christianity is to be of real help to such persons, Christians must co-operate heartily and kindly with every effort which they make to reform. The words of Jesus about visiting him in prison doubtless refer

primarily to visiting persecuted Christians in prison, but the great principle of service which he enunciated applies to all mankind. If the church once seriously faces the problem of the criminal, it will be making a sadly needed application of the life in Christ to a social need.

The church has, however, an even more pressing duty, if possible, than that of seeing that our punitive legislation and institutions exercise the Christian spirit. It is the one great agency in the State which turns men from sin to righteousness. Its conception of punishment cannot be exclusively that of earthly punishment. It knows the suffering that must lie in individual degeneration, and it must endeavor to save men and women spiritually by preaching the awfulness of sin and the readiness of the heavenly Father to forgive. That is a form of the social gospel sociologists are inclined to overlook, but which the church never can. The power of the gospel to transform evil lives into good lives is one of the greatest social forces in existence. In the same proportion as the church recognizes the awfulness of sin, both in itself and its consequences, and endeavors to bring men and women to Jesus Christ, will it be of first importance in the social order. If the ideals of Jesus can appeal only to good men, it is a part of the work bequeathed by him to his followers to see that men are converted from sin to a life of faith and love. Then only can they be called upon to full exercise of the principles of the social gospel.

Quiz

1. What is one of the unfortunate misinterpretations of the gospel? 2. What would be the result of a laxity of punishment of sin in society? 3. Explain the difference between revenge and punishment. 4. Why is it difficult for an ex-convict to reinstate himself in society? 5. What is Jesus' message for bad men? 6. To what do the words of Jesus, about visiting him in prison, refer? 7. What is the duty of the church in regard to the punishment of sin? 8. What promises are made by God to the repentant sinner?

Questions for Further Study

1. What seems to you to be the greatest evil in the administration of law in your community? 2. What are some of the advantages of separating delinquent boys from habitual criminals? 3. Describe the work of the juvenile court, if there is one in your community. 4. Describe the work (if there is not such a court) that is being done in your community in behalf of the discharged prisoners. 5. What would be the advantage of having a thoroughly Christian police force? 6. What are some of the evil effects of punishment which is done without due regard to the rights of the accused? 7. Describe the working of a prison and the routine of the prisoners. 8. Do you think a revival is a good method of preventing crime?

CHAPTER XVI

REMEDIAL LEGISLATION

Not all evils can be cured by law, but there are few that can be cured without law. The individual needs legislation to protect him against the injury that might be wrought by unscrupulous or evil men; and he also needs legislation to reenforce his own efforts toward his ideals. Public opinion, although of great influence in itself, must sooner or later, if it is to be effective, take the shape of laws. But the order of our procedure is generally, first, the individual, then public opinion, and then the law. Abuses of privilege, positive wrong-doing, are not apt to be corrected or prevented without the co-operation of these three elements.

The need of remedial legislation is by no means limited to the fields in which we find specific teaching of Jesus and his apostles. It is clear that the gospel is not a text-book, consisting of specific commands. To enter so sympathetically into the purposes of Jesus, and to appreciate so thoroughly the principles of the gospel, that all laws shall look not only to the prevention of evil, but to the building up of positive good, that has always been the wisest course. The sort of lawgivers we need are those who are ready to test all reforms by those tests

which the gospel itself furnishes. Jesus left us no Talmud. He was the way to Life through Truth. Liberty is not license. No man has any "right" to do what will injure society.

Legislation, for instance, looking to the destruction of the liquor traffic, involves two elements: first, a decision as to what is the Christian ideal toward which legislation shall work; and, secondly, what is the wisest method of bringing about that ideal so far as the sale of intoxicating liquors is concerned. There is pretty general agreement among good citizens as to the ideal toward which temperance agitation should aim; but there has always been, and is still a difference of opinion among legislators, as to the precise method by which these ideals are to be gained. Now, the attitude of Christians is here clear. They should, as far as possible, co-operate with those who are opposing the liquor traffic, in the spirit of fraternity. The question as to the best method of procedure is one of practical policy; in some localities, and in some States, more radical action is possible than in others. But in all instances some positive action is possible on the part of Christians. What shall we say of a community, which could be named, in which all temperance reform is blocked by the fact that the stock of a brewery company is owned by church-members?

There is need also of legislation concerning other social evils, some of which are so frightful and deadly as to demand immediate and radical treat-

ment. Unless the Christian spirit is allowed to express itself in preventive and punitive legislation, these evils are likely to be perpetuated indefinitely. Every community has its men and women who are making money through pandering to vice. If they sought only to meet the demands of vicious appetites, it would be bad enough; but their influence is persistent upon young men and women, and even upon boys and girls. Public opinion, in itself, is impotent to prevent the existence of such evils. Individuals find it impossible to exert influence strong enough to prevent their continued existence and growth. It is a matter for legislation which shall carry the Christian ideal over into legislation, and of officers who will enforce such legislation. Such vicious people should be prevented from injuring the community at all costs; but they can not be so prevented unless Christians see to it that punishment awaits their wrong-doing. Such business as the "white slave traffic" is too horrible to be dealt with tenderly.

But remedial legislation is not limited simply to the correction and punishment of vice of any sort. It is also concerned with the positive incorporation of the Christian ideal into all laws of the land. Let us be thankful that we can see many distinct advances along ethical lines through legislation. Particularly notable are the ethical gains which are resulting from the legislation governing the employment of women and children, the regulation of sweat-shops,

the campaign against tuberculosis and other forms of disease which threaten widespread injury to the community, and whose spread cannot be checked without certain positive laws. Then too, there is the legislation affecting the houses of the poor which, although but just beginning, is showing results in some of our large cities. Regulation of immigration, and the more careful examination of immigrants, form a part of our legislation which, although not always so thorough or as well administered as might be desired, is none the less bound to protect not only the nation from undesirable immigration, but also the immigrants themselves from deception and extortion.

The Christian spirit is also building itself into the legislation calculated to prevent the poor from becoming the victims of conscienceless money-lenders and others who seek to grow rich off the miseries of the poor. Public sentiment, if once it is under the sway of the ideals of the gospel, will go far in the direction of bringing in laws which will enable the poor man to gain rights in the courts without the excessive expense which now too often attaches to the pursuit of justice.

An examination of the legislation of the various States of our country, as well as of our federal government, will show that our laws are increasingly becoming regardful of evils and rights which, a few years ago, were unconsidered. This change is, in large measure, traceable to the men and

women who are under the control of ideals which Jesus enforced. Some of them may not belong to the church, but few of them have not at some time or other come under the influence of the gospel. Their interest in social reform has not been that of those who dream of better days in the past, but it is also that of Christian scholars and men of affairs, who not only know the ideals and are loyal to them, but who also seek the wisest and most practical methods of reaching those ideals.

Unfortunately, however, it is in this connection that Christians have sometimes failed to live up to their own ideals. Legislation for the control or the destruction of methods of money-getting to which church-members are not committed, such as the liquor traffic, nowadays generally finds support among our church-members. But the case is more complicated when reform touches industries in which Christian people are engaged. The evils arising in our industrial world are not so readily seen to be truly evils, hateful to the Christian conscience. Here, above all else, the church needs to be a valiant champion of moral idealism.

The immediate demand in this particular is that the young Christian should become acquainted with the work being done by reformers; that he learn to appreciate sacrifices and devotion to noble effort; that, as a voter, he see to it that such legislators and officers are elected as will sympathize with efforts looking toward the maintenance by law of

proper conditions in all branches of life; and that punishment through law of all efforts made to erect material wealth above the personal be just and immediate.

As a practical suggestion to insure the constant participation of the Christians in this phase of social regeneration, it may be urged that the organizations of the church, like the brotherhoods, the young people's society, and the women's societies, should have a representative in the various reform bodies. Such representatives would serve to keep the church informed concerning these important matters. Politicians are quick to recognize a body of men and women who are in earnest. Christians cannot render a greater social service than to make politicians feel that they are constantly under observation; to agitate for laws that shall embody the spirit of Christianity; and to see that such agitation is not merely spasmodic, but is maintained continuously until a Christian public opinion compels legislation that shall embody the principles of fraternity and real liberty.



Quiz

1. To be effective, how must public opinion be supplemented? 2. What is the wisest course to pursue regarding reform? 3. What two elements are involved in legislation looking to the destruction of the liquor traffic? 4. What should be the atti-

tude of Christians in this respect? 5. What measures should be taken by Christians to protect young men and women from evil influence? 6. What other forms does remedial legislation take besides the checking of wrong-doing? 7. What is required of the young Christian in order that he might help in the social regeneration? 8. How may the church be kept informed concerning the various reform bodies?

Questions for Further Study

1. What are the laws governing saloons in your town? 2. Is prohibition gaining, or losing ground in the United States? 3. What should be the attitude of Christians toward wise reforms in municipal affairs? 4. Can a good law enforce itself? 5. How far can bad men be counted on to help in reforms? 6. Should ministers preach on law and lawbreaking? 7. What laws now before the voters seem particularly deserving of the support of Christians? 8. If you had absolute political power, what social evil would you correct first of all? How?

CHAPTER XVII

EDUCATION

IF there was anything that Jesus judged absolutely essential, it was the training of his followers. The name under which he ordinarily went was that of "rabbi," or "teacher," and those who were closest to him were known as pupils, or disciples. The education which he gave was, of course, not of the same sort as that which is given nowadays in the schools. He did not teach mathematics or some ancient language. He had no classroom or text-book. He held no classes; his pupils passed no examination, and they got no degrees. But, nevertheless, they were instructed steadily by Jesus. One of the chief aims he had in selecting the Twelve was that they might be with him, and so could come to understand him. We have not very full reports of most of the months of instruction which Jesus gave his disciples; but such as have been preserved for us in the Gospels make it plain that Jesus worked along the lines of the great teachers. He did not force beliefs upon his disciples, and he was the farthest possible from simply cramming them with information. He instructed them in such a way that they grew in appreciation of what he was and of the significance of the gospel he was announcing.

In the history of the church, teachers have always been reckoned as necessary. In Paul's writings they are found in the list of those who had special gifts of the Spirit; and while it is not quite clear what some of these earlier teachers actually taught, it cannot be doubted that they instructed the churches in the application of the gospel.

In course of time the field of Christian instruction expanded, and there sprang up the schools in the chief cities. Christian schools have never disappeared, even to our day. They have changed in character; some of them have grown rich in endowments. But no other religion has ever so persistently turned to education as has the Christian. It could not be otherwise, seeing that we have the promise of Jesus that the Spirit would lead men into all truth. Nothing could be farther from the purpose of the gospel than to try to keep people ignorant in order that religious leaders may control them. There are undoubted dangers connected with education, but they are the dangers which come from liberty.

As education is now organized, however, it is in danger of neglecting the moral and idealistic aspects of life. The separation of Church and State in America led to the removal of moral and religious instruction from the public schools. To offset this, the Roman Catholic leaders have established their parochial schools, in which their children are taught the church doctrines and certain phases of morality

along with the rudiments of secular education. A few other religious bodies have undertaken to do the same thing. Beyond this, however, great diversity of opinion prevails as to how far the school can be used as an agency for teaching morality. We are all convinced that the educated rascal is the worst sort of a rascal; but how can we prevent the education of rascals?

The need of moral instruction, however, is no greater than the need of instruction along the line of positive Christian ideals. It is imperative that young people should come to realize the difference between righteousness and sinfulness, between honesty and dishonesty; but it is quite as important that there should be systematic and wisely directed education in the principles of the gospel. For it must never be forgotten that the gospel is not simply a new grouping of commandments; it is rather the message of an ideal life as actually lived by Jesus, and the revelation of the principles which should govern that life in others. And, what is even more, it is an assurance that God is able to help people to come toward the ideal and be saved from sin. These principles have been built over into many theologies, but they stand independent of any theology. They are among the foundations of social ethics, and should be a great part of the educational process.

This, however, is not to say that it would be advisable for the public schools to teach Christian

doctrine. There are many considerations which come in here, chief among which is the need that Christian truths should be taught by earnest Christians, and it has seemed wiser to develop the Sunday-school as the place in which to give specifically Christian moral and religious instruction. Now, the Sunday-school is not a very old institution, but it is developing into one of the greatest influences in Christian civilization. That for which it stands is becoming more clearly perceived every year, and the methods which it adopts are being increasingly brought into line with the best educational theory. Its friends, however, are convinced that it should exert still larger influence in the future than in the past; that its instruction must be more systematic, and that more time should be allowed for the work of grounding boys and girls in the principles of the gospel. It is both an evangelistic and an educational institution, and in each of these capacities it is calculated to be of the greatest significance to society.

Our colleges and universities and professional schools of various sorts are all factors in the shaping up of a public education that shall be Christian. If we cannot evangelize the educational process, we shall not be likely to find educated men and women devoted to the cause of the church. They will grow indifferent to its ethics and to its various activities. The Young Men's and the Young Women's Christian Associations are rendering great service in this particular. Their Bible-study courses in our colleges

and universities are being pursued by thousands of our best young men and women. Their work, and the similar work on the part of the various church organizations, such as the Christian Endeavor, Baptist Young People's Union, the Epworth League, should be increased so that religious influence may be constantly exerted over our young people.

Quite as important as anything in this connection is the necessity that school teachers should be thoroughly in sympathy with the gospel, and that they should be positive in their insistence upon the supremacy of the spiritual good. There is real danger lest our teachers, both in school and in college, shall regard themselves simply as persons to give information in their particular lines, and so come to overlook their responsibility in developing the character of their pupils.

There are many points in our educational system at which the Christian students themselves can be of great influence. In athletics, in student organizations, in societies and fraternities the Christian should influence others along Christian lines. Evangelization is no more the business of the teacher than of the pupil. It is to be hoped that there will be the heartiest co-operation between all parties, in order that there may be brought to bear upon the thousands of young people now being educated those influences which shall not only train them to be better citizens, better artisans, better fathers and mothers, but also better men and women.

Quiz

1. What difference is there between Jesus' manner of instructing his disciples and modern methods of instruction? 2. How has Christian instruction expanded? 3. What is the danger connected with education? 4. Should the Church and State be separated? 5. Of what importance is the Sunday-school? 6. In what way may school teachers be of great influence? 7. How may young people's societies help in social service? 8. In what ways can the teacher and the pupil co-operate?

Questions for Further Study

1. What are some of the faults of our present school system? 2. Should school committees see to it that school teachers are persons of positive Christian character? 3. What are the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations doing for college students? 4. How might your Sunday-school be improved? 5. Is your church a good illustration of the principles set forth by Paul as those to be embodied in churches? 6. What can Sunday-schools do in saving boys and girls from fourteen to twenty-one years of age to the church? 7. What social service might your young people's society undertake? 8. What social service is your Sunday-school rendering the community?

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CHURCH

THE Bible has two types of religious leaders, the prophet and the apostle. The two were alike in many respects. Each was commissioned of God to bear a message to his age. Each found himself in opposition to some of the great social forces of his day; and each faced martyrdom. They differed, however, in one very important respect: The prophet did not attempt to organize men who accepted his message into a community. The apostle accomplished that precise thing when he founded churches. The New Testament is superior to the Old in many particulars, but in none more than this. It represents not only a message of completer revelation of God's will and saving power, but it also shows how that message came to be socialized.

The church is the community of those who are believers in Jesus Christ. It began when the first disciples came to Jesus. True, his little community was not organized in any such way as that in which the church deemed it best later to organize itself; but his disciples formed a group which lived under different ideals than the rest of the world, and became, in course of time, the founders of other groups. We see the beginning of this attempt of

putting the gospel into social relations in the church of Jerusalem, and it is noteworthy that the first steps in organization were for the purpose of rendering more effective the Christian impulse of social service as seen in the care of the widows.

It is sometimes said that the early church did even more than this; that it constituted itself a communistic group. But this is a mistaken view. The church was not communistic in any sense in which the social economist would use the word. If it had been, it would have been more like the Shakers, who engage in the production of wealth without private ownership in the process. What the early church did was to devote such property as its members wished to contribute to a common fund for the care of the poor. It never undertook to go into co-operative manufacturing, or co-operative farming, or any other form of co-operative industry. It never even undertook to command people to sell what they had and to lay it at the feet of the apostles. The sin of Ananias and Sapphira was not that they had not sold all their property, or that they had not given all the proceeds of what they had sold to the apostles; it was, rather, that they lied about it and tried to appear more generous than they were.

The churches that Paul founded did not seem to have even this common charity fund, but in them all the apostles undertook to apply Christian principles to social life, although not to the social life of

those who are not Christians. The letters of Paul always distinguished sharply between the man who had accepted Jesus as Christ and joined the church, and the man who had done neither. Like Jesus, he never expected that the latter would respond to ideals and teachings that would apply to the former. So everywhere we find developing in the New Testament a sort of Christian sociology. That is, a theory of social life which presupposed the regenerating influence of God's Spirit. Many of the members of the churches in Corinth and Galatia and Ephesus were by no means perfect; but even in their case Paul could appeal to their Christian experience and show how he expected even erring Christians to respond to the ideals of Jesus.

We have no evidence that the early Christians went into politics. In fact, in the Roman empire there was practically no politics into which they could go, although both Paul and Peter did urge them to be good citizens and to obey the authorities. We have no record that the early church in any large way undertook any social reform. What it really did undertake was to develop within itself an ideal of social life in accordance with the teaching of Jesus. Thus it raised the family above pagan ideals. Then too, it developed a sense of social solidarity within itself. Paul speaks of the church as the body of Christ in which individual Christians are the members—an exceedingly beautiful and effective illustration which modern churches themselves might do

well to make operative in their life. While it did not undertake to abolish slavery, it did do that which was bound sooner or later to destroy slavery: it treated slaves as brothers, and declared that in Christ there were neither bond nor free. It even insisted upon a splendid internationalism within itself when it embodied the teaching that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Gentile. And most extraordinary of all, it brushed aside the conception so prevalent in the ancient world of the inferiority of women by declaring that in Christ there is neither male nor female.

It is, of course, true that the church did not fully embody all of its own ideals. Human frailty was strong in the New Testament churches as well as in their modern successors. But this does not affect the significant fact that in the Christian church there was developing a new conception of social relations. Time only was needed for this social conception, at first applicable only to the churches and Christian society, to spread out into an ideal for society at large. And thus the church, in a way that every Christian should be proud to recognize, became a sort of type of what society might be if only the spirit of Jesus became widespread.

Here we see one very important fact: the social life of the church of the New Testament was purer and higher, and more fraternal than the life of the world about it. Whenever in subsequent ages the church has undertaken to incorporate the ideals of

the non-Christian society in itself or in the lives of its members it has grown weak. Asceticism is not a Christian conception, but no more is a mad rush after amusement or wealth. The church has never gained by compromising with the world. Both it and the world have suffered. As a social group the church must always have ideals superior to those outside itself. If it fails in this it fails at the point where it has been, and must be, of greatest significance to social evolution. If a city set on a hill moves into the valley, it becomes a city in the valley.

In our day there is great need that the church should recognize this fact. Society expects more of Christians than it does of those who are not Christians, not only in point of purity of life, but in the way of loyalty to those great ideals of Jesus which it claims to represent. If it is to be of significance to-day it must still be a city set on a hill.

Should it then enter politics? Not as a church, but it should train its members to go into politics as Christian men. That is to say, it should be a teacher of social as well as individual ethics. It should make the consciences of its members sensitive to every form of injustice, and inculcate the ideals which men in their civic capacities should put into operation.

Should then the church, as a church, enter social reform? Certainly not at the expense of its spiritual mission. There is a division of labor in society, and the church has its particular function—to turn men

to God and educate them in the ideals of the gospel, and to fill its members with a passion for righteousness and service. Strictly speaking, it is not the business of the church to attend to the sewerage of a town, or the slums of a great city, or the labor problem. Such things are the business of church-members individually. But any church that fails to educate the life of its members to look at all such matters from the moral point of view and to strive to put the principles of Jesus into social life is falling far short of its duty. It is no wonder that men and women who are struggling with the evils of society should sometimes grow impatient with churches that do not undertake such leavening of humanity with the social gospel. The best way in which to meet their criticism is not to exclude them from church-membership or to censure them in any severe way, but to show by deeds just how loyal Christians are to the ideals and life of their Master.

But this is not by any means to say that the church has no social duties as a church. As an organization it ought to be establishing institutions and engaging in work something more than strictly evangelistic, important as that may be. Among such duties are, first of all, the care for its own members. A church whose poor members are neglected disgraces its Lord. If secret organizations, like the Masons and Odd Fellows, care for their members through sickness and death, certainly the church should do as much.

Then too, the church ought to co-operate with the associated charities of the community. It will not be enough for it merely to have a member or two in the associated charity organizations, although this is better than nothing. It ought rather to be in closest touch with them, furnishing both workers and money. What is more, it should supply the proper spirit of love which will offset that professionalism which so besets men and women engaged in any form of altruism.

Again, a church ought to organize within itself committees for visiting hospitals and caring for the poor, whether they are in hospitals or in poorhouses, or in any other sort of public institution. The State can care for the bodies of the sick, but the church ought to cheer them with its own joy and do something for their spiritual well-being.

If the church undertook this work of co-operating with organized charities and county institutions, it would feel anew the world's need of Jesus and at the same time bring pressure for good to bear upon these public institutions. It would grow both evangelistic and socially influential.

But above all, the first duty of the church is to turn men from sin to God. The world needs more of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit that shall convict it of sin. A church must be keen enough to see the moral issues in our social life, and brave enough to champion justice and fraternity in all such issues.

A church that is afraid of its own doctrines is the poorest sort of institution imaginable. A church that dares not imitate its Christ is sure of its Christ's condemnation. It is not more sociology that the world asks of the church, but an earnest insistence on the gospel that shall save men from their sins and then inculcate in them a sensitiveness to the unrighteousness in social life, and a determination, no matter what it costs, to bring the moral issue straight home to its community, and especially to its members. A man is not saved according to Jesus unless he has within him the spirit of love. A church that does not dare stand for love is a body of unsaved people. And regenerated people are the only material out of which a regenerated society can be built.



Quiz

1. In what ways were the prophet and the apostle alike? How did they differ? 2. In what way is the New Testament superior to the Old? 3. How did the church have its beginning? 4. What was the principle of charity of the early church? 5. What did the early church undertake with regard to politics? 6. What was the relation of the social life of the church of the New Testament to the life of the world about it? 7. In what ways should the church co-operate with associated charities? 8. What is the first duty of the church?

Questions for Further Study

1. What would probably happen to a community if all the churches were closed? 2. How did the early Christians put the principles of Jesus into operation? 3. Are there Christians outside the churches? Why? 4. How can a church extend its social influence? 5. Do you think your church is more interested in social reform than it used to be? 6. Do you believe a church interested in social service need grow less evangelistic?

CHAPTER XIX

MISSIONS

THE modern church has listened to the words of its Master, and is going into all the world preaching the gospel. When the great missionary movement of to-day began, the paramount motive was that of saving individual heathen from punishment in the hereafter. In the case of savage people, it is true, missionaries also sought to introduce the manners and customs of a higher civilization, but in general such considerations were secondary. The missionary movement, like the church of the New Testament times, did not attempt social reformation; it was to save men out from heathenism into the kingdom of heaven.

But the labor of missionaries has in a way repeated the history of Christianity in the Roman empire. It was impossible for the Christian spirit to limit itself to future salvation. The missionary was the representative, not merely of the gospel, but of a civilization that was in part the product of the gospel. Missions have inevitably become not only a great religious, but a great social movement. It would be difficult to find a more pervasive application of the principles of Christianity to human life than is to be seen in the missionary station. Only

think of what an enormous social influence has been possessed by men like John G. Paton, in Australasia; Griffith John and Timothy Richards, in China; Verbeck, in Japan; Clough, among the Telugus; and Hume in India. These are only illustrations of a great class of men and women who have found their lifework and their influence upon history immeasurably increased by taking up work in foreign lands.

The first significant change in the direction of enlarging missions was in education. The converts had to be instructed. That meant the development of a literature and schools of all grades. And literature and schools are now the chief aids of missions. We find them throughout the entire non-Christian world. Their influence cannot be overestimated, for from them the spirit of Christianity is brought in touch with that wider world of non-Christian life which will not formally yield to the gospel. It is true that the moral influence of such education is not so great as we might wish, at least in India, but it is none the less a mighty enlightening influence. Nowadays missionaries are even introducing manual training and various forms of technical instruction.

Another social influence of missions has lain in the practice of medicine. From the start, Christian missionaries were forced to care as best they could for the diseased persons they saw about them. By degrees they came to see that one of the greatest opportunities for ministration in the name of our

Lord was in the care of the sufferers. So men and women studied to be medical missionaries; hospitals were founded, and throughout the non-Christian world can now be found the means by which the Christian spirit of social service is being extended to the outcast and the poor in their sickness and poverty.

But missionaries have had even wider influence, if possible. To many of them has come the call to be the advisers of viceroys and kings. It was the missionaries who laid the foundations for the national educational system of Japan. There are missionaries all over Asia who are being asked for advice by the political authorities, and their influence has showed itself in many a reform. In our very day they have been the great agents in checking the frightful abuse of the Congo natives. In all these situations the motive has been primarily evangelical. The missionary has been able, in a way that sometimes reads like a romance, to revolutionize and reorganize civilization in the name of Christ. It is, of course, true that they have not been able to introduce an absolutely perfect social order, but they have at least been able to bring the spirit of the gospel directly to bear upon social evolution. Their work must not be overlooked by the sociologist. The social gospel was not intended only for America and Europe. It is applicable wherever there are men and women. The work of the missionary is an illustration of its message as truly as are im-

proved tenements and municipal reform in our great cities.

But we cannot limit our thought of missions to Christian work in foreign lands, important and extraordinary as that now appears in the light of great transformation through which Asia is passing. There are missionaries on the American continent who are equally heroic exponents of the gospel.

There is the work among the Eskimos and the Indians; the ministration of Doctor Grenfell to the fishermen on the coast of Labrador, which extends across the entire range of social activities, business, home life, disease, mechanics, religion.

Vastly wider in influence is the work of Christian missionaries on the frontier of America and Canada. In point of self-sacrifice and willingness to endure privation for the sake of others, the lives of such missionaries are in no wise second to those of the missionary in foreign lands. Any person who has visited our great Northwest, and has seen how the Sunday-school worker and the missionary pastor have built up their churches and carried over the spirit of the gospel into every form of life, will realize how much our country owes to their efforts. Our missionary work among the foreign-speaking populations in America has been of importance not only religiously, but politically. No better training in the American spirit could be given the newly arrived immigrant than that given by Protestant churches. In a new world facing a new life under

new conditions, the new settler, whether he be of American or foreign descent, needs the message of the gospel to enable him to withstand the temptations which spring up all too quickly.

The history of the extension of Christianity shows no greater triumph than in the development of Christian civilization. These transformations which are being wrought in our own day have been duplicated again and again whenever the Christian church has taken upon itself seriously the task of evangelization. One has only to recall the history of the early missionaries to Ireland and Germany, to Africa and the Goths, to realize how true this statement is.

In the light of these indubitable facts it is hard to maintain one's patience with those who condemn foreign missions because they lead to the exportation of so much money from America to foreign lands. In dollars and cents, the missionary activity has repaid our nation; but who undertakes missionary work in order that commerce may be developed? The extension of Christianity is not an underhand method of building up trade. It is a magnificent effort to extend principles that must some day govern individual and social life.

It is interesting to see, further, that our modern church life is learning much from the mission fields. In fact, some of our most important questions are there getting at least a tentative answer. Such questions include, for example, the co-operation of

different religious bodies in church services and the establishment of colleges. Sectarian rivalry is a source of injury, not only to the home, but foreign missions. It is on the foreign mission field that the church is getting its most effective lessons in denominational tolerance and co-operation. Missionaries are also teaching us some of the great secrets of social evolution, particularly the inherent identity of humanity the world over.

Viewed thus, from the point of view of social regeneration, missions, whether at home or abroad, are seen to be a vastly important agency, not only for the extension of the Christian religion, but for the leavening of the world with the principles of Christian civilization. The church of Christ, if it is to be the power it should be, owes it to the world to offset the bad influences which so often accompany commercial expansion with the fraternal influences of Christianity. To belittle missions or to be indifferent to them is not only disloyal to the gospel itself, but it may mean that the vices and weaknesses of a Western civilization will be given unrestricted scope to injure the world. If there were no other motive operative we should prosecute the work of missionaries in self-protection, for in the great international unity which is now developing as never before, no nation is safe in company with others not controlled by genuine Christian principles. To win Asia and Africa and the islands of the sea to Jesus Christ is to guarantee that the entire world will be

a better, a safer, and a happier place in which our descendants shall live.



Quiz

1. What is the primary motive of missions? 2. In what way have missions become a great social movement? 3. What political influence have missionaries had? 4. Tell how the education of missionaries has been developed? 5. How has the practice of medicine aided missionaries in their work? 6. Mention some missionaries and their work in America. 7. What does the church learn from foreign missions? 8. What effect will missions have on future generations?

Questions for Further Study

1. What would probably have been the present condition of Japan without the work of missions? 2. Give illustrations of modern educational methods in missions. 3. What has the missionary done for literature? 4. Give brief accounts of the social and political influence of the missionaries mentioned in this chapter. 5. What share did religion have in the founding of your town? 6. What is being done to help the newly arrived immigrant?

CHAPTER XX

THE VICARIOUS TENTH OF SOCIETY

SOCIOLOGISTS have written much about the submerged tenth—that miserable part of the populations of our great cities who live in the slums. The existence of such a body of men, women, and children is the great outstanding accusation against our modern social world, full of misery itself and full of danger to all the other members of society.

But there is another body of people that may be called the “vicarious tenth of society”—those who do the world’s work, but do not get the world’s pay. Whether such persons number just a tenth or not of society is, of course, immaterial. What the term seeks to emphasize is, that tithe of itself which society unconsciously devotes to social service. Here would belong every earnest, self-denying man and woman who makes the welfare of others the controlling motive of life. Most ministers, teachers, settlement workers are outstanding examples of such a class.

Our study must have made it evident that, if the world is to be blessed with the social gospel, the church must be something more than a sort of universal Red Cross Society. It must, of course, minister to the unfortunate and to the sorrowful; but

he has utterly misunderstood the spirit of Jesus who insists that such service is its final mission. The church must not only be a good Samaritan, caring for those whom the ruthless members of society, be they never so respectable, have injured, but it must also see to it that the road from Jerusalem to Jericho is well policed so that merchants can travel up and down its length in safety. From any point of view, vice is a fearful weight upon society. But from the truly Christian point of view it is even vastly more expensive, for it costs human souls. Christian men ought to see to it that such waste is stopped.

But ideals are expensive. If one holds them and refuses to live up to them, they cost one his true life. If one attempts to live up to them, they may cost one the world. That is what Jesus meant when he put the world and a man's life over against each other, and asks what it would profit a man if he gained the world and lost his life. That is what he meant in part too, when he insisted that his disciples must expect persecution. It is one of the terrible things of human history that his words have so often come true. Sin makes men desperate enemies of even those who would help them. True prophets have generally suffered. It is the false prophets who have been popular. Jesus saw that the world hated his followers because they would try to live in the world according to ideals which the world itself had repudiated. This is one of the lessons of the cross: righteousness and love and the effort to give justice

involve men in struggle and loss and suffering. Jesus did not call men to any easier life than he himself lived. Whoever followed him was to take up his cross and follow the Master as he carried his. And the same call comes to the Christian of to-day. True, we do not have to face the rack, and gallows, and the stake, but there are other things that a man must face who would attempt to put the principles of Jesus into social life. He must face misunderstanding, misrepresentation, envy, slander. Sometimes he must face financial loss, and even ruin, as well as loss of friendships. But the call to such heroic self-sacrifice is always to be heard. The disciple of the Son of man must, like his Master, seek to minister, not to be ministered unto. Thus only can he live out that real life which it is the mission of the gospel to beget within him.

For the individual cannot be lost in society if the gospel is to have its real power. However much we may see the social implications of the regenerate life, however much we may see the need of the principles of Jesus in the transitional age in which we live, the world will not be saved *en masse*. The gospel does not belittle the individual. We cannot hope to meet its ideals by disregarding personal duties. To-day, as never before, is there need of an individualism which, while abounding in social impulses and service, is loyal to the worth of each individual soul. We cannot shift our personal duties on to society. If individual Christians refuse loyalty

to the ideals of Jesus the world at large will not give such loyalty.

And thus we come back again to duty and the necessity of those great decisions which commit a man to the cause of Jesus Christ. The vicarious tenth of society must be composed of vicarious individuals.

Is this vicarious service the gospel? No, it is the cost of the gospel. It is the call of the cross to men of to-day. It is born of the protest of Jesus against the selfishness and love of ease that besets us all.

But is it the call to a forlorn hope? Is the man who devotes himself to the ideals of the gospel at any cost fighting for a losing cause?

The answer to such questions is Jesus himself. He won by suffering. The self-sacrifice that loyalty to his ideals engenders is always the exchange of a less for a greater good; of a cause which though apparently victorious, is really to be defeated for a cause that apparently defeated is really to be victorious. The kingdom of God is sure to come. The future lies not with the enemies of love and fraternity, but with their champions. For God works with them, and it is the Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom.

In Christ's name let us believe this good news! The church of to-day needs not only the call to duty, but the call to hope; to such hope as that by which Paul said we are saved. Enthusiasm can only come when one believes that success is certain. The spirit

of loyalty to a cause so great as that which the gospel embodies needs to be aroused by a larger faith in God. If he is in his world, as Jesus declares him to be, then the victory of the Christian ideals of society is only a matter of time. We do not need to be sociologists or public speakers, ministers, or teachers; the army of the Lord needs privates just as truly as it needs officers. But one thing it needs above everything else: an overwhelming loyalty to the principles of the gospel and an enthusiastic, contagious faith that it represents the ideals ultimately to control human life. For every Christian must look forward to the time when sin shall be crushed, and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. Loyalty to such a cause may mean vicarious sufferings, but it also means ultimate victory. The vindication of the call to the cross of social service is the assured triumph of the kingdom of God.

Let us then end our study with the message with which Jesus began his mission:

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS AT HAND! REPENT AND BELIEVE THE GOOD NEWS!



Quiz

1. What class of people go to make up the "vicarious tenth of society"? 2. What was Jesus' meaning when he asked what it would profit a man if he gained the world and lost his life? 3. Give

examples of the difficulties of the followers of Jesus in living up to ideals. 4. What are the difficulties of the present day in living up to ideals? 5. In what relations does the individual stand to society? 6. What is the ultimate end of the followers of Christ? 7. Why should hope be a great factor in our faith? 8. Are we as loyal as we might be to the cause of Christ?

Questions for Further Study

1. What is the fundamental difference between a real Christian and the man who is really not a Christian? 2. Has it been your experience that in any good undertaking a few people have to do most of the work? 3. What do you find the greatest difficulty to living a life of service for others? 4. If Jesus were to come to preach to our day as he preached to the people in Jerusalem, what do you suppose the attitude of his church would be to his message? 5. What seems to you to be the greatest good in the world? •

BOOKS SUGGESTED FOR SUPPLEMENTARY READING

Henderson. *Social Studies from the Christian Point of View*. University of Chicago Press. 1909. A brief text-book, admirably arranged, and somewhat more advanced than the present studies.

Mathews. *The Social Teaching of Jesus*. Macmillan Company. 1897. A study of the teachings of Jesus in their relation to social matters without detailed consideration of their application to modern social conditions.

Peabody. *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*. Macmillan Company. 1900. A treatment less exegetical than the preceding work, but which treats fully of the application of Jesus' principles to our social life.

Rauschenbusch. *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. Macmillan Company. 1907. A striking arraignment of the shortcomings of the church, and a suggestion of what to do. Favorable to socialism.

Mathews. *The Church and the Changing Order*. Macmillan Company. 1907. Discussion of the social aspects of Christianity, with especial reference to the evangelization of the formative forces in society.

Gladden. *The Church and Modern Life*. Houghton Mifflin Company. 1908. A treatment of the practical bearings on the social gospel.

Ross. *Sin and Society*. Houghton Mifflin Company. A trenchant study of a vital theme.

Kirkup. *A History of Socialism*. Longmans Green. 1906. Probably the best book in its field.

Kirkup. *An Inquiry Into Socialism*. Longmans Green. 1908. A careful study of an important theme.

Wells. *New Worlds for Old*. Macmillan Company. 1908. Probably the most attractive "unorthodox" picture of modern socialism ever drawn.

Spargo. *Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism*. Huebsch. 1908. A notable presentation of the non-economic aspects of the socialistic movement.

Campbell. *Christianity and the Social Order*. Macmillan Company. 1907. A plea for Christian socialism, by the eloquent and intense pastor of the City Temple, London.

Balfour and others. *The Case Against Socialism*. Macmillan Company. 1908. Probably the strongest criticism of socialism at the disposal of the general reader.

In addition the reader may be referred to Bliss. *The New Encyclopedia of Social Reform*. Funk & Wagnalls. 1908.

3 6877 00008 7840

3 7840
UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY
UPLAND, CALIFORNIA

Date Due

[illegible]

1442

S

16212

~~UPLAND COLLEGE LIBRARY~~
~~UPLAND, CALIFORNIA~~

261 Mathews, Shailer

M442

S The social gospel

16212

LIBRARY
PACIFIC COLLEGE
FRESNO 2, CALIFORNIA

